

THE
FOUR GOSPELS,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.

WITH
PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,
AND
NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY GEORGE CAMPBELL, D.D. F.R.S. EDINBURGH.

Principal of the Marischal College, Aberdeen.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

ΜΟΝΗ ΟΥΤΕΟΝ ΤΗ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ.

BOSTON :

PUBLISHED BY TIMOTHY BEDLINGTON AND CHARLES EWER.

Treadwell's Power Press.—T. H. Carter, Printer.

—
1824.

TO THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN DOUGLAS, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

MY LORD,

THE trouble you were last year so good as to take, in perusing a considerable part of this work in manuscript, and the favourable sentiments you were pleased to express of what you had got time to peruse, have emboldened me to dedicate it to your lordship. I mean not thus to bespeak your future patronage, or even approbation of the whole, when you shall become acquainted with it. That can be only as your better judgment shall direct. I well know that, if the book have no merit of its own, no patron whatever can long preserve it, or ought to preserve it, if he could, from its natural fate, oblivion. But I am happy in this opportunity of expressing to the world my gratitude for the patronage you have already bestowed both on it, and on its author. I am

happy also to have it in my power to inscribe a work intended for promoting the best interests of mankind, the cause of truth and probity, to one who, to the satisfaction of the candid and judicious, has approved himself an able defender of the most important truths, as well as a successful detector of fraud and falsehood.

I have the honour to be, with great respect,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obliged,

and most obedient servant,

GEORGE CAMPBELL.

ABERDEEN,
SEPTEMBER 17, 1788.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

PAGE

PREFACE	i
-------------------	---

DISSERTATION I.

Observations on the Language and Idiom of the New Testament, on the Diversity of Style, and on the Inspiration of the Sacred Writers.

PART I. The Language and Idiom	1
PART II. The Style and Inspiration	33

DISSERTATION II.

The Causes to which the principal Differences in Languages are imputable; the Origin of the Changes produced on the Language and the Idiom of the Jews; the principal Difficulties to be encountered in translating the sacred Books.

PART I. The Causes of the Differences in Languages	43
PART II. The Origin of the Changes in the Idiom of the Jews	57
PART III. The Difficulties found in translating the Scriptures	68

DISSERTATION III.

- Of the Style of the Scripture History, particularly the Gospels.—Its Perspicuity defended against the objections of Father Simon . . .* 80

DISSERTATION IV.

- Observations on the right Method of proceeding in the critical Examination of the Books of the New Testament* 132

DISSERTATION V.

- Of the proper Version of some Names of Principal Import in the New Testament . . .* 177

- PART I. Of the Phrase *ἡ Βασιλεια του θεου*, or *των ουρανων* 178
- PART II. Of the Name *το Ευαγγελιον* 186
- PART III. Of the Phrase *ἡ Καινη Διαθηκη* 214
- PART IV. Of the Name *ὁ Χριστος* 217

DISSERTATION VI.

- Inquiry into the Differences in the Import of some Words commonly thought synonymous.*

- PART I. *Διαβολος, Δαιμων, and Δαιμονιον* 239
- PART II. *‘Αδης and Γεεννα* 272
- PART III. *Μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι* 321
- PART IV. *‘Αγιος and ‘οσιος* 339
- PART V. *Κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, and διδασκειν* 370

DISSERTATION VII.

Inquiry into the Import of certain Titles of Honour occurring in the New Testament.

PART I. <i>Κυριος</i>	396
PART II. <i>Διδασκαλος</i> , Rabbi	428

PREFACE.

IN compliance with a custom, which is not without its advantages, I purpose, in this place, to lay before the reader some account of the following work, its rise and progress, nature and design. To do so, will, perhaps, be thought the more necessary, as there have been, in this and the preceding century, many publications on the Gospels, both abroad and at home, in some or other of which, it may be supposed, that all the observations of any consequence, which can be offered here, must have been anticipated, and the subject in a manner exhausted. I am not of opinion that the subject can be so easily exhausted as some may suppose. I do not even think it possible for the richest imagination to preclude all scope for further remark, or for the greatest acuteness to supersede all future criticism. On the other hand, it must be owned possible, that a man may write copiously on a subject, without adding to the stock of knowledge provided by those who wrote before him, or saying any thing which has not been already as well, or perhaps better, said by others.

How far this is applicable to the present publication, must be submitted to the judicious and intelligent reader. In the mean time, it may be hoped that it will not be judged an unfair attempt at bespeaking his favour, to give him a brief account of the origin and preparation of the work now offered to his examination.

As far back as the year 1750, soon after I had gotten the charge of a country parish, I first formed the design of collecting such useful criticisms on the text of the New Testament, as should either occur to my own observation, or as I should meet with in the course of my reading; particularly, to take notice of such proposed alterations on the manner of translating the words of the original, as appeared not only defensible in themselves, but to yield a better meaning, or at least, to express the meaning with more perspicuity or energy. Having, for this purpose, provided a folio paper book, which I divided into pages and columns, corresponding to the pages and columns of the Greek New Testament which I commonly used, I wrote down there, in the proper place, as they occurred, such alterations on the translation as, in my judgment, tended to improve it, and could be rationally supported. And having divided the pages in the middle, I allotted the upper part of each for the version, and the lower for *scholia*, or notes containing the reasons (wherever it appeared necessary to specify reasons) of the changes introduced. In this way I proceeded many years, merely for my own improvement, and that I might

qualify myself for being more useful to the people intrusted to my care. I did not assign to this occupation any stated portion of my time, but recurred to it occasionally, when any thing occurred in reading, or offered itself to my reflections, which appeared to throw light on any passage of the New Testament.

Things proceeded in this train, till I found I had made a new version of a considerable part of that book, particularly of the Gospels. The *scholia* I had added, were indeed very brief, being intended only to remind me of the principal reasons on which my judgment of the different passages had been founded. But soon after, from a change of circumstances and situation, having occasion to turn my thoughts more closely to scriptural criticism than formerly, I entered into a minute examination of many points concerning which I had thrown together some hints in my collection. On some of the points examined, I have found reason to change my first opinion: on others I have been confirmed in the judgment I had adopted. I have always laid it down as a rule, in my researches, to divest myself, as much as possible, of an excessive deference to the judgment of men; and I think that, in my attempts this way, I have not been unsuccessful. I am even confident enough to say, that I can with justice apply to myself the words of the poet:

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri;

or rather the words of one much greater than he; I have learnt, in things spiritual, to *call no man*

Master upon earth. At the same time that I have been careful to avoid an implicit deference to the judgment of any man, I have been ready to give a patient hearing, and impartial examination, to reason and argument, from what quarter soever it proceeded. That a man differs from me on some articles, has given me no propensity to reject his sentiments on other articles; neither does the concurrence of his sentiments with mine on some points, make me prone to admit his sentiments on others. Truth I have always sought (now there is no respect of persons in this pursuit): and, if a man may pronounce safely on what passes within his own breast, I am warranted to say, I have sought it in the love of truth.

It must be acknowledged that, though a blind attachment to certain favourite names has proved, to the generality of mankind, a copious source of error; an overweening conceit of their own reason has not proved less effectual in seducing many who affect to be considered as rational inquirers. In these I have often observed a fundamental mistake, in relation to the proper province of the reasoning faculty. With them, reason is held the standard of truth; whereas, it is, primarily, no more than the test or the touchstone of evidence, and, in a secondary sense only, the standard of truth. Now the difference between these two, however little it may appear, on a superficial view, is very great. When God revealed his will to men, he gave them sufficient evidence, that the information conveyed to them by his ministers, was a revelation from him. And it cannot

be justly doubted that, without such evidence, their unbelief and rejection of his ministers would have been without guilt. *The works, said our Lord, which the Father has given me to finish, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me*¹. And again : *If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin*². His works were sufficient evidence that what he taught was by commission from God ; and without such evidence, he acknowledges their unbelief would have been blameless : whereas, on the contrary, having gotten such evidence, there was nothing further they were entitled to, and consequently their disbelief was inexcusable.

Some modern rationalists will say, ‘ Is not ‘ the subject itself submitted to the test of reason, as well as the evidence ? ’ It is readily granted, that a subject may be possessed of such characters as are sufficient ground of rejecting it in point of evidence, and is, therefore, in this respect, submitted to the test of reason. If any thing were affirmed that is self-contradictory, or any thing enjoined that is immoral, we have such internal evidence, that nothing of this sort can proceed from the Father of lights, and the Fountain of good, as all the external proofs which could be produced on the other side, would never be able to surmount. The proofs, in that case, might confound, but could not rationally convince, the understanding. We may, for example,

¹ Jo. v. 36.

² Jo. xv. 24.

venture to assert, that no conceivable evidence from without, could render the theology of Hesiod or Homer, in any degree, credible. Thus far, therefore, it will be allowed, that reason is entitled to examine and judge concerning the subject itself: for there may be something in the subject that may serve as evidence, either in its favour, or against it. At the same time it must be owned that, the more the subject is above the things which commonly fall under the discussion of our faculties, the narrower is the range of our reason; insomuch that, in things so far beyond our reach, as those may be supposed to be which are conveyed by revelation from God, there is hardly any internal character that can be considered as sufficient to defeat a claim, otherwise well supported, but either, as has been said, absurdity or immorality.

Now, here lies the principal difference between the impartial seekers of truth, whose minds are unbiassed on every side, and those who, under the appearance of exalting human reason, idolize all their own conceptions and prejudices. I speak not of those who reject revelation altogether; but of those who, whilst they admit the truth of the Christian revelation in general, consider their own reason as competent to determine, and prejudge, as I may say, what it is fit for God, either to declare as truth, or to command as duty. Such people, for example, if they do not discover an useful purpose that any particular declaration in Scripture can answer, boldly conclude, in defiance of the clearest positive evi-

dence, that it is not there : if they cannot divine the intention of Providence in the production of any being, or order of beings, of which there may be frequent mention in holy writ, they infer that such being, or order of beings, notwithstanding the notice there taken of them, does not exist. They will not admit the reality of an operation, of which they do not perfectly comprehend the manner, though the former may be a matter clearly revealed in Scripture, the latter not. Now the rejection of the aid of reason altogether (the common error of fanatics of every denomination), and such a conviction as that now described of its all-sufficiency, are extremes which the judicious, but humble-minded Christian, will think it incumbent on him equally to guard against.

Indeed those deifiers of human reason, of whom I have been speaking, seem, all the while, to mistake the proper province of reason. They proceed on the supposition that, from her own native stock, she is qualified for the discovery of truth ; of all such truths, at least, as are of any consequence to a man to be acquainted with. The fact is nearly the reverse : for except those things which pass within our own minds, and which we learn solely from what is called consciousness, and except the deductions made from self-evident or mathematical axioms, all our information relating to fact, or existence of any kind, is from without. Hence all our knowledge of arts, sciences, languages ; of history, philosophy, and every thing in which human life is concerned. Do I, by this, mean to depreciate

human reason as a thing of little consequence? Far from it. Reason, I am sensible, is absolutely necessary to render us capable of that information from without, by which we are enabled to make so great progress in knowledge. For want of this power entirely, or at least in the requisite degree, how little, comparatively, is the greatest knowledge which the most sagacious of the brute creation can attain? I cannot, therefore, be justly thought to derogate from a faculty which, by my hypothesis, constitutes the radical distinction between man and beast. Would a man be understood to depreciate that admirable organ of the body, the eye, because he affirmed, that unless the world, which is without the body, furnished us with light, our eyes could be of no service to us? Reason is the eye of the mind: it is in consequence of our possessing it, that we are susceptible either of religion or of law. Now the light by which the mental eye is informed, comes also from without, and consists chiefly in testimony, human or divine.

I would recommend it, therefore, to those, who are accounted the most refined rationalists in religion, to take the trouble to reflect a little, and inquire what is the method which they, and indeed all, must follow, in the acquisition of human knowledge. In natural history, for example, how insignificant would be our progress, if our conviction were to be regulated by the same maxims by which those men seem to regulate their faith in matters of revelation? If our not knowing the use of any thing were a

sufficient reason for disbelieving its existence, how many animals, how many vegetables, how many inanimate substances, apparently useless, or even noxious, should we discard out of our systems of nature, inflexibly denying that they exist any-where, except in the disordered imaginations of men? Nor should we make greater proficiency in the other branches of science. Of nothing have we clearer evidence than of this, that by means of the food which animals swallow, life is preserved, the body is nourished, the limbs gradually advance in strength and size, to their full maturity. Yet, where is the philosopher, where is the chemist, who can explain, or will pretend to understand, the process whereby the nourishment is converted into chyle, and the chyle into blood, and the blood into skin, and flesh, and bones and sinews?

Now if, in matters of science, merely human, our ignorance of the use, in the one case, and of the manner of operation, in the other, does not preclude our belief of the fact, a belief which ultimately rests, in most cases, on the testimony of our fellow-creatures; can we think it reasonable to be more shy of admitting a fact, on the testimony of God, when, in effect, we admit that sufficient ground is given us to conclude that we have his testimony? For I do not here argue with the deniers of revelation, but with those who, professing to believe it, reject its obvious meaning. Are we better acquainted with things divine than with things human? or with things eternal than with things temporal? Our Lord, in

his conversation with Nicodemus, seemed to consider it as an acknowledged truth, that things earthly are more level to the natural capacity of man than things heavenly³. Yet how soon would an effectual stop be put to our progress in every branch, even of earthly science, were we to lay down as maxims, that the existence of any being, however well attested, whereof we cannot discover the use, is not to be believed; and that the production of an effect, if we do not comprehend the mode of operation in the cause, is incredible? The much greater part of all human knowledge, whether of things corporeal, or things spiritual, things terrestrial, or things celestial, is originally from information. Revelation means no other than information from God; and whatever human knowledge we derive from the testimony of our fellow-mortals, which is more than ninety-nine parts in a hundred of all we are possessed of, is, if I may be allowed the expression, a revelation from man. In regard to both, we ought, no doubt, in the first place, to be satisfied that we have the proper testimony: but when this point is ascertained, I think it unaccountable to reject the obvious meaning of the divine testimony (which is indirectly to reject the testimony), on grounds which no judicious person would think sufficient to warrant him in rejecting the testimony of a man of character. If ye have not satisfactory evidence, that what claims to be the testimony of God is really such, ye are no

³ Jo. iii. 12.

doubt entitled to reject it. But do not first admit the testimony, and afterwards refuse your assent to what it manifestly implies; and that for such a reason as would prove no obstacle to your assent, on the information of a fellow-mortal. This is surely the reverse of what might be expected from a humble pious Christian. *For if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater*⁴.

Besides, this conduct, in rejecting the obvious sense of the divine testimony, is the more inexcusable, as the circumstance on which the rejection is founded, is such as the whole analogy of nature leads us to expect, in all the works of the Creator. If, in every part of the creation, we find that there are many creatures, the purpose of whose existence we cannot investigate; and that there are hardly any natural productions, in which, though, from experience, we may discover the cause, we can trace its operation; it is but just to conclude, that this unsearchableness to human faculties, is a sort of signature impressed on the works of the Most High, and which, when found in any thing attested as from him, ought to be held, at least, a presumption in favour of the testimony.

But, though nothing can be more different from an implicit adoption of all the definitions, distinctions, and particularities of a sect, than the general disposition of the rationalist; there is often a great

⁴ 1 Jo. v. 9.

resemblance in their methods of criticising, and in the stretches which they make for disguising the natural interpretation of the sacred text. Each is, in this, actuated by the same motive, namely, to obtrude on others that interpretation which suits his favourite hypothesis. And, if we may say of the one, that he is too foolish to be improved by teaching; we may, with equal justice, say of the other, that he is too wise to attend to it. Revelation, surely, was never intended for such as he. Our Lord said to the Pharisees, that he came not *to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance*⁵. We may, with like reason, say, he came not to instruct the *learned*, but the *ignorant*. Nay he, in effect, says so himself. It was to *babes* in knowledge, not to *sages*, that the things of God were revealed by him⁶. The disposition of children, so often recommended as necessary for our giving a proper reception to the Gospel, and obtaining admission into the kingdom, refers as clearly to the teachable temper of children, free from prepossessions and self-conceit, as to their humility and innocence. How strongly is this sentiment expressed by the Apostle: *If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise*⁷! The judicious and candid will not mistake me, as, in matters of religion, decrying the use of reason, without which, I am sensible, we cannot proceed a single step; but as pointing out the proper application of this faculty.

⁵ Mat. ix. 13.⁶ Mat. xi. 25.⁷ 1 Cor. iii. 18.

In what concerns revelation, reason has a two-fold province ; first, to judge whether what is presented to us as a revelation from God, or, which is the same thing, as the divine testimony to the truth of the things therein contained, be really such or not ; secondly, to judge what is the import of the testimony given. For the former of these, first, the external evidences of Christianity offer themselves to our examination, prophecy, miracles, human testimony ; and then the internal, arising from the character of the dispensation itself, its suitableness to the rational and moral nature of such a creature as man. As to the second point, the meaning of the revelation given ; if God has condescended to employ any human language in revealing his will to men, he has, by employing such an instrument, given us reason to conclude that, by the established rules of interpretation in that language, his meaning must be interpreted. Otherwise the use of the language could answer no end, but either to confound, or to deceive. If the words of God were to be interpreted by another set of rules than that with which the grammar of the language, founded in general use, presents us ; with no propriety could it be said, that the divine will is revealed to us, till there were a new revelation furnishing us with a key for unlocking the old. This consideration points to the necessity of the grammatical art, and of criticism, by means of which, readers, especially of a distant age and country, must arrive at the requisite proficiency in the language. As to both these, it is evident that the

sacred writers address themselves to our reason. *Why*, said our Lord⁸, *even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?* And the Apostle Paul⁹: *I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say.* With the first, the evidences of the truth of our religion, I am not here concerned. The great design of this work is, to deliver with plainness, in our own tongue, a very essential part of what was, more than seventeen centuries ago, communicated in another tongue, to the inhabitants of countries remote from ours. It was, in order the more effectually to answer this end, particularly, to remove all prejudices and prepossessions which might prove obstructions in the way, that I determined, on reflection, to add to the Version, the Preliminary Dissertations, and the Notes.

The necessary aids for acquiring the knowledge of an ancient and foreign tongue, are more or fewer, according to the circumstances of the case. The distance of time and place, and the great difference, in respect of customs, manners, and sentiments, between those to whom the sacred writers first addressed themselves, and the present inhabitants of this island, could not fail to occasion our meeting with some difficulties. And, although it cannot be justly doubted, that a good deal of light has been thrown on some points, by the labours of former critics; it can as little be denied that, by the same means, many things have been involved in greater darkness. In other critical inquiries, wherein religion is not con-

⁸ Lu. xiii. 57.

⁹ 1 Cor. x. 15.

cerned, there is little to bias the judgment in pronouncing on what side the truth lies. But where religion is concerned, there are often, not only inveterate prejudices, but secular motives, to be surmounted, to whose influence few can boast an entire superiority. Besides, I shall have an opportunity to observe, in the sequel, that, in what relates to this subject, there has come a gradual change on the meaning of many words, consequent on the changes which have been gradually introduced into the church, in religious ceremonies, modes of government, and formularies of doctrine. Old names are given to things comparatively new, which have, by insensible degrees, arisen out of the old, and have at last supplanted them.

To trace such changes with accuracy, is an essential quality of philology. A translator, when he finds that the words used by former translators, though right at first, have since contracted a meaning different from that in which they were originally employed, sees it necessary, that he may do justice both to his author and to his subject, to substitute such terms as, to the best of his judgment, are adapted to convey those sentiments, and those only, intended by the author. When a change is made from what people have been long accustomed to, it is justly expected that the reason, unless it be obvious, should be assigned. Hence arises the propriety of *scholia*, or notes, both for vindicating the version, and for supplying further information, which, if not necessary to all, is, to most readers, highly useful. The frequent

allusions to rites, customs, and incidents, well known to the natives of the writer's country, and to his contemporaries, render such occasional illustrations, as can be given in the notes, very expedient for those of distant lands and ages. It is not on account of any peculiar obscurity in sacred writ, that more has been judged requisite in this way, with regard to it, than with regard to any other writings; but partly on account of certain peculiarities in the case, and partly on account of the superior importance of the subject. Of both these I shall have occasion to take notice in the Preliminary Dissertations. There is a further use in bringing additional light for viewing these subjects in, though we admit that the light absolutely necessary was not deficient before. To brighten our perceptions is to strengthen them; and to strengthen them, is to give them a firmer hold of the memory, and to render them more productive of all the good fruits that might naturally be expected from them. The most we can say of the best illustrations which, from the knowledge of Christian antiquity, critics have been enabled to give the sacred text, is like that which the ingenious author of *Polymetis* says, in regard to the utility of his inquiries into the remains of ancient sculpture and painting, for throwing light upon the classics. "The chief use," says he¹⁰, "I have found in this sort of study, has not been so much in discovering what was wholly unknown, as in

¹⁰ Dialogue VI.

“strengthening and beautifying what was known
“before. When the day was so much over-
“cast just now, you saw all the same objects
“that you do at present; these trees, that river,
“the forest on the left hand, and those spreading
“vales on the right: but now the sun is broke
“out, you see all of them more clearly, and with
“more pleasure. It shows scarce any thing that
“you did not see before; but it gives a new life
“and lustre to every thing that you did see.”

It cannot, however, be denied that, on this subject, many things have been advanced, in the way of illustration, which have served more to darken, than to illuminate, the sacred pages. I have great reason to think that, in my researches into this matter, I have been impartial; but, whether I have been successful, is another question: for, though partiality in the method of conducting an inquiry, sufficiently accounts for its proving unfruitful, the utmost impartiality will not always ensure success. There are more considerations which, in a work of this kind, must be taken into view, than even readers of discernment will at first have any apprehension of. Several of the changes here adopted, in translating both words and idioms, will, I know well, upon a superficial view, be judged erroneous; and many of them will doubtless be condemned as frivolous, which, it is to be hoped, will, on deeper reflection, be admitted, by well informed judges, both to be more apposite in themselves, and to render the matter treated more perspicuous.

In illustrating the principles on which some of the changes here made are founded, a great deal more, in the way of critical discussion, was found necessary, in order to do justice to the argument, than could, with propriety, be thrown into the notes. A conviction of this, first suggested the design of discussing some points more fully in preliminary dissertations. This, however, is not the only use which these discourses were intended to answer. Though there has appeared, since the revival of letters in the West, a numerous list of critics on the Bible, little has been done for ascertaining the proper, and, in some respect, peculiar, rules of criticising the sacred books; for pointing out the difficulties and the dangers to which the different methods have been exposed, and the most probable means of surmounting the one, and escaping the other. Something in this way has been attempted here. Besides, I have been the more free in applying my philological remarks in these discourses, to various passages in the other apostolical writings, as I had a more extensive view in translating, when I first engaged in it, than that to which at last I found it necessary to confine myself.

I have endeavoured, in the interpretations given, to avoid, with equal care, an immoderate attachment to both extremes, *antiquity* and *novelty*. I am not conscious that I have in any instance, been inclined to disguise the falsity of an opinion, because ancient, or, with partial fondness, hastily to admit its truth, because new. That an opinion is the opinion of the multitude is, to some, a powerful

recommendation ; to others it appears an infallible criterion of error ; to those who are truly rational it will be neither. There are, indeed, many cases wherein antiquity and universality are evidences of some importance. It has been, all along, my intention never to overlook these circumstances, where they could be urged with propriety ; for certain it is, that singularity is rather an unfavourable presumption. But I hope that, with the help of some things which are treated in the Preliminary Dissertations, the intelligent and candid reader will be convinced, that nowhere have I more effectually restored the undisguised sentiments of antiquity, than where I employ expressions which, at first sight, may appear to proceed from the affectation of novelty. I have, to the utmost of my power, observed the injunction which God gave to the Prophet Jeremiah¹¹ : I have *stood in the ways* ; I have *looked and asked for the old paths*. And if, in this research, I have, in any instances proved successful ; men of discernment will, I am persuaded, be sensible, that nowhere have I been luckier in conveying the genuine conceptions of the most venerable antiquity, than in those places which, to a superficial examination, will appear, in point of language, most chargeable with innovation. The very command, to look and to ask for the old paths, implies that it may happen that the old paths are deserted, consequently untrodden, and known, comparatively, to very few. In that case, it is manifest that the person who

¹¹ Jer. vi. 16.

would recommend them, runs the risk of being treated as an innovator. This charge, therefore, of affecting novelty, though very common, must be, of all accusations, the most equivocal; since, in certain circumstances, nothing can more expose a man to it, than an inflexible adherence to antiquity.

I may, in this work, have erred in many things: for to err is the lot of frail humanity; and no merely human production ever was, or ever will be, faultless. But I can say, with confidence, that I have not erred in any thing essential. And wherefore am I thus confident? Because I am conscious that I have assiduously looked and asked for the old paths; that I have sought out the good way; that I might, at all hazards, both walk therein myself, and recommend it to others: and because I believe the word of the Lord Jesus: *Whosoever will do the will of God, shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God*¹². This I think a sufficient security, that no person, who is truly thus minded, shall err in what is essential. In what concerns the vitals of religion, rectitude of disposition goes farther, even to enlighten the mind, than acuteness of intellect, however important this may be, in other respects. But the exercise of no faculty is to be despised, that can be rendered, in any degree, conducive to our advancement in the knowledge of God. Nay, it is our duty to exert every faculty in this acquisition, as much as possible.

¹² Jo. vii. 17.

In an age like the present, wherein literary productions are so greatly multiplied, it is not matter of wonder that readers, when they hear of any new work, inquire about what, in modern phrase, is called the *originality* of the thoughts, and the beauties of style it possesses. The press teems daily with the labours of the learned. Plenty in this, as in every other commodity, makes people harder to be pleased: hence it happens, that authors are sometimes tempted, for the sake of gratifying the over-nice and fastidious taste of their readers, to affect paradoxes, and to say things extravagant and incredible, being more solicitous about the newness, or even the uncommonness, than about the truth, of their sentiments. Though I cannot help thinking this preference injudicious, whatever be the subject, it is highly blameable in every thing wherein religion or morals are concerned. To this humour, therefore, no sacrifice can be expected here. The principal part of the present work is translation. A translator, if he do justice to his author and his subject, can lay no claim to originality. The thoughts are the author's; the translator's business is to convey them unadulterated, in the words of another language. To blend them with his own sentiments, or with any sentiments which are not the author's, is to discharge the humble office of translator unfaithfully. In the Translation here offered, I have endeavoured to conform strictly to this obligation. As to the remarks to be found in the Dissertations and Notes, nothing was farther from my purpose than, in any instance,

to sacrifice truth to novelty. At the same time I will, on the other hand, frankly acknowledge that, if I had not thought myself qualified to throw some light on this most important part of holy writ, no consideration should have induced me to obtrude my reflections on the Public. If I have deceived myself on this article, it is, at the worst, a misfortune which appears to be very incident to authors. But, if some readers, for different reasons will think differently, should find me, on some articles, more chargeable with the extreme of novelty, than with that of triteness of sentiment; I hope that the novelty, when narrowly examined, will be discovered, as was hinted above, to result from tracing out paths which had been long forsaken, and clearing the ancient ways of part of the rubbish in which, in the tract of ages, they had unhappily been involved. Those who are profoundly read in theological controversy, before they enter on the critical examination of the divine oracles, if they have the discernment to discover the right path, which their former studies have done much to prevent, and if they have the fortitude to persevere in keeping that path, will quickly be sensible, that they have more to unlearn, than to learn; and that the acquisition of truth is not near so difficult a task, as to attain a superiority over rooted errors and old prejudices.

As to the exposition of the text, where there is thought to be any difficulty, it is seldom that any thing new can be reasonably expected. If, out of the many discordant opinions of former expositors,

I shall be thought, by the judicious, to have generally chosen the best (that is, the most probable), I have attained, in regard to myself, my utmost wish. On this article, the exercise of judgment is requisite, much more than of ingenuity. The latter but too often misleads. In adopting the interpretation of any former translator or expositor, I commonly name the author, if at the time he occur to my memory; but not when the exposition has been so long, and is so generally, adopted, that it would be difficult to say from whom it originated. Let it be observed, also, that when no person is named, I do not claim to be considered as the discoverer myself. A person will remember to have heard or read a particular observation or criticism, though he does not recollect from whom, or in what book; nay, more, to reading and conversation we doubtless owe many sentiments, which are faithfully retained, when the manner wherein they were acquired is totally forgotten.

For my own part, I do not pretend to much reading in this way. I have not been accustomed to read whole commentaries. My way is (what I recommend to others, especially students), to consult them only occasionally, when, in reading, I meet with any difficulty; and not even then, till after other helps, particularly the various readings, the ancient versions, the context, and the use of the sacred writers in other passages, have been, with the aid of concordances, in vain recurred to. Some seem to make the whole study of Scripture merely an exercise of memory; in my opinion it consists much more in

the exercise of judgment and reflection. It is only thus that we can hope to attain that acuteness, and preserve that impartiality, in judging, which will secure us against calling any *man father upon earth*. In this way, we shall avail ourselves of the services of the best expositors, on different, and even opposite, sides, without subjecting ourselves to any. We may expect to meet, in all of them, with faults and imperfections: but, if I can safely reason from experience, I do not hesitate to say, that the least dogmatical, the most diffident of their own judgment, and moderate in their opinion of others, will be ever found the most judicious. Those, on the contrary, who are either the idolaters of their own reason, or blindly devoted to that of some favourite doctor, to whom they have implicitly resigned their understandings, display as often the talent of darkening a clear passage, as of enlightening a dark one. However, I am far from thinking that even such may not be sometimes consulted with advantage. Considerable abilities are often united in the same person with considerable defects. And whatever a man's prepossessions in point of opinion may be, there are some things in Scripture which cannot be said to have any relation to them. In regard to all such, it may justly be expected, that learning and talents will produce some light. There are few, therefore, who have really the advantages of literature and abilities, who, whatever be the party or system to which they have attached themselves, may not occasionally prove useful aids.

For the readings here adopted, I have been chiefly indebted to the valuable folio edition of the Greek New Testament published by Mill, and that published by Wetstein, but without blindly following the opinion of either. In the judgments formed by these editors, with respect to the true reading, they appear to be in extremes: the former often acquiesces in too little evidence, the latter requires too much. This, at least, holds in general. But whether I agree with, or differ from, either, or both of these, about any particular reading by which the sense is affected; that every intelligent reader may judge for himself, I commonly assign my reason in the notes. I do not, therefore, mean to enter farther into the subject, or examine the critical canons on which they found, or the opinions they have given on the comparative excellence of different manuscripts and versions. What has been written on this subject by Simon, Bengelius, Michaelis, and others, renders any discussion here the less necessary.

For the ancient versions, where it appeared proper, I have had recourse to Walton's Polyglot; of some, as the Syriac, the Gothic, or as it is now with greater probability accounted, the Frankish, the Anglo-Saxon, the modern Greek, and the Vulgate, I have copies, as well as of all the modern translations quoted in this work. All the late English translations of any account, I had provided. There is indeed one, or perhaps two, that I have not met with, about which, to say the truth, from the accounts I have had of their plan and method, and from some specimens, I

have not felt much solicitude. I am, however, far from saying that these may not also have their use, and be, in expressing some things, luckier than versions which are, on the whole, superior.

As to the language, particularly of the version itself, simplicity, propriety, and perspicuity, are the principal qualities at which I have aimed. I have endeavoured to keep equally clear of the frippery of Arias, and the finery of Castalio. If I have hazarded, on any occasion, incurring the censure of the generality of readers, on account of the diction, I am certain it is in those places where, from a desire of conveying neither more nor less than the exact thought of the author, I have ventured to change some expressions to which our ears have been long accustomed. But on this point I mean to say nothing further in this place. The reasons on which I have proceeded, in such alterations, are fully explained in the preliminary discourses, which I consider as so necessary to the vindication of many things in the translation; that I do not wish the judicious reader, if, in any degree, acquainted with the original, to read the Version, till he has given these Dissertations a very attentive and serious perusal.

As I have never yet seen a translation of the Bible, or of any part of it, into any language I am acquainted with, which I did not think might be, in several places, altered for the better; I am not vain enough to imagine, that the Version here presented to the Public will, by any class of readers,

be accounted faultless. Part of this work has long lain by me in manuscript; for I may justly say of it what Augustin, if I remember right, says of one of his treatises, *Juvenis inchoavi, senex edidi*. Now, in that part I have been making corrections, or at least alterations, every year; and I have no reason to doubt that, if it were to lie longer by me, I should still be altering and correcting. As I am not an implicit follower of any man, because I think no man can plead an exemption from either faults in practice, or errors in opinion; I am, at the same time, far from arrogating to myself a merit which I refuse to acknowledge in others. It is not difficult to make me distrust my own judgment, and impartially re-examine my own reasoning. I say *impartially*, because I am conscious that I have often, in this manner, revised what I had advanced, when I found it was objected to by a person of discernment; and, in consequence of the revisal, I have been convinced of my mistake. I will venture to promise, therefore, that I shall give all due attention to any criticisms or remarks, candid or uncandid, which shall be made on any part of this work. Criticisms made in an uncandid manner may, as to the matter of them, be well founded, and, on that account, deserve attention. But if there appear neither reason in the matter of the criticism, nor candour in the manner of producing it, the most prudent part in an author is to let it pass without notice.

If the language of the translation, in the third volume, shall be thought not unsuitable, and sufficiently perspicuous, I have, in what concerns the

expression, attained my principal object. The rest, I imagine, will be intelligible enough to those who are conversant in questions of Christian antiquities and criticism. Sensible of the disadvantages, in point of style, which my northern situation lays me under, I have availed myself of every opportunity of better information, in regard to all those terms and phrases, in the Version, of which I was doubtful. I feel myself under particular obligations, on this account, to one Gentleman, my valuable friend and colleague, Dr. Beattie, who, though similarly situated with myself, has, with greater success, studied the genius and idiom of our language; and of whom it is no more than justice to add, that the acknowledged purity of his own diction, is the least of his many qualifications as an author. But if, notwithstanding all the care I have taken, I shall be found, in many places, to need the indulgence of the English reader, it will not much surprise me. One who often revises and alters, will sometimes alter for the worse: and, in changing, one has not always at hand a friend to consult with. The apology which Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, in the second century, makes for his language, in a book he published in defence of religion, appears to me so candid, so modest, so sensible, at the same time so apposite to my own case, that I cannot avoid transcribing and adopting it: “Non autem ex-
“quires a nobis qui apud Celtas commoramur, et
“in barbarum sermonem plerumque avocamur,
“orationis artem quam non didicimus, neque vim
“conscriptoris quam non affectavimus, neque orna-

“ mentum verborum, neque suadelam quam nesci-
 “ mus : sed simpliciter et vere et idiotice, ea quæ
 “ tibi cum dilectione scripta sunt, cum dilectione
 “ percipies ; et ipse augeas ea penes te, ut magis
 “ idoneus quam nos, quasi semen et initia ac-
 “ cipiens a nobis ; et in latitudine sensus tui,
 “ in multum fructificabis ea, quæ in paucis a
 “ nobis dicta sunt ; et potenter asseres iis qui
 “ tecum sunt, ea quæ invalide a nobis relata
 “ sunt¹³.”

Need I, in so late and so enlightened an age, subjoin an apology for the design itself, of giving a new translation of any part of scripture ? Yet there are some knowing and ingenious men, who seem to be alarmed at the mention of translation, as if such an attempt would sap the very foundation of the Christian edifice, and put the faith of the people in the most imminent danger of being buried in its ruins. This is no new apprehension. The same alarm was taken so early as the fourth century, when Jerom was employed in preparing a new translation of the Bible into Latin ; or, at least, in making such alterations and corrections on the old Italic, as the original and the best Latin manuscripts should appear to warrant. The people in general exclaimed ; and even the learned were far from applauding an attempt which, in their judgment, was so bold and so dangerous. I do not allude to the abuse thrown out by Ruffinus, because he was then at variance with Jerom on another account ; but even men, who were

¹³ Adversus Hæreses, lib. i. Prefatio.

considered as the lights of the age, were not without their fears. Augustin, in particular, who admired the profound erudition of Jerom, and had a high esteem of his talents, yet dreaded much, that the consequence of such an undertaking would prove prejudicial to the authority of Scripture; and did not hesitate to express his disapprobation in very strong terms. That interpreter, however, persevered, in spite of the greatest discouragements, the dissuasion of friends, the invectives of enemies, and the unfavourable impressions which, by their means, were made upon the people. The version was made and published: and those hideous bugbears of fatal consequences, which had been so much descanted on, were no more heard of.

Luckily, no attempt was made to establish the new version, by public authority. Though Damasus, then bishop of Rome, was known to favour it, the attempt to obtrude it upon the people, would probably have awaked such a persecution against it, as would have stifled it in the birth. On the contrary, its success was left entirely, as it ought to be, to the efficiency of its own merit. In consequence of this, the prejudice very soon subsided: many of those who were at first declared enemies of the undertaking, were entirely reconciled to it. Augustin, himself, came to be convinced that it was guiltless of those horrors which his warm imagination had foreboded. Nay, he did not scruple to recur to it for aid, in explaining the Scriptures. The version, thus quietly introduced about the end of the fourth, or

the beginning of the fifth, century, and left to its fate, to be used by those who liked it, and neglected by those who disliked it, advanced in reputation every day. The people very soon, and very generally, discovered that, along with all the simplicity they could desire, it was, in every respect, more intelligible, and, consequently, both more instructive, and more agreeable, than the old. The immediate effect of this general conviction, was greatly to multiply the copies, which proved, in a very few centuries, the total extinction of the Italic, formerly called the Vulgate, version, and the establishment of the present Vulgate, or Jerom's translation in its room. To make this sudden revolution, which is a matter of so much importance, better understood by the unlearned, it is proper to observe, that it was in consequence of no law of the church, or indeed of any Christian country, that the old Italic first, and the present Vulgate afterwards, were used in churches in the offices of religion. Such matters were regulated in every individual church, by the bishop and presbyters of that church, as appeared most for the edification of the people. Now the general and growing reputation of the new version, made it soon supplant the old. As it was not to any law of church or state, that the Italic owed its promotion at first; so it required no law of either, to make it give place, quietly, to a better version. After this of Jerom had come gradually to obtain every where the preference, and to be used in private families, by individuals, it might be expected that so general an approbation

would gradually usher it into the churches. For an authoritative sentence, of either pope or council, in favour of any translation, was a thing unheard of till the sixteenth century, when the decree of the council of Trent was obtained in favour of the present Vulgate. Now, the Vulgate, we may observe, by the way, had been, for ages before, by the tacit consent of all ranks, in full possession of all the prerogatives conferred by that council.

But, though the introduction of a new translation produced none of those terrible consequences which had been presaged; though, on the contrary, by rendering the style of Scripture purer, as well as more perspicuous, it came soon to be read by the people with greater pleasure and improvement; yet it must be owned, that the clamour and jealousies that had been raised on this subject, were productive of one very unfavourable effect upon the interpreter. Though it did not make him desist from his undertaking, it made him prosecute it with a timidity which has proved hurtful to the work itself. Many things which, by the old interpreter, had been improperly rendered; many things which had been obscurely, or even unintelligibly, expressed, Jerom, through dread of the scandal which too many changes might occasion, has left as he found them. We have, therefore, the utmost reason to conclude, that to this cause alone it is imputable, that the present Vulgate is not greatly superior to what we find it. Jerom was strongly impressed with a sense of the danger to which his attempt exposed him. This

appears from many parts of his writings; particularly from his letter to pope Damasus, prefixed to the translation of the Gospels: "Periculosa presumptio," says he, "judicare de cæteris, ipsum ab omnibus judicandum: senis mutare linguam, et canescentem mundum ad initia retrahere parvulorum. Quis, enim, doctus pariter vel indoctus; cum in manus volumen assumpsit; et a saliva quam semel imbibit, viderit discrepare, quod lectitat; non statim erumpat in vocem, me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veteribus libris, addere, mutare, corrigere."

How dismal were the apprehensions which were entertained immediately after the Reformation, on account of the many translations of Scripture which came in quick succession, one after another? Have men's fears been justified by the effect? Quite the reverse. The violent concussion of parties at the Reformation produced, as might have been expected, a number of controversies, which were, for some time, hotly agitated; but the greater part of these were in being before those versions were made. And if a few have arisen since, many have subsided, which once made a great noise, and produced a great ferment in the church. Nothing will be found to have conduced more to subvert the dominion of the metaphysical theology of the schoolmen, with all its interminable questions, cobweb distinctions, and wars of words, than the critical study of the sacred Scriptures, to which the modern translations have not a little contributed. Nothing has gone farther to satisfy

reasonable men that, in many of the profound disputes of theologians, revelation could not, with justice, be accused of giving countenance to either side. Yet no disputes have been productive of more rancour in the disputants, or been carried on with greater virulence, than those which are merely verbal.

It has been said, that the introduction of different translations tends to unsettle men in their principles, particularly with regard to the authority of sacred writ, which, say they, is made to speak so variously in these productions. For my part, I have not discovered, that this is, in any degree, the effect. The agreement of all the translations, as to the meaning, in every thing of principal consequence, makes their differences, when properly considered, appear as nothing. They are but like the inconsiderable variations in expression which different witnesses, though all perfectly unexceptionable, employ in relating the same fact. They rather confirm men's faith in Scripture, as they show, in the strongest light, that all the various ways which men of discordant sentiments have devised, of rendering its words, have made no material alteration, either on the narrative itself, or on the divine instructions contained in it. People are at no loss to discover, that the difference among interpreters lies chiefly in this, that one renders the account of things, which that book exhibits, more intelligible, more perspicuous, or even more affecting, than another. These differences are, I acknowledge, of great moment to readers; they are such as may show one version to be greatly superior to another in point of use; yet as they are all

compatible with justness of representation in every thing essential to the historical and didactic parts of the work, they are so far from affecting the credibility of the whole, that they serve not a little to confirm it. A gentleman, who knows neither Greek nor Hebrew, but understands Latin; and several modern tongues, told me once, he had read the New Testament in different languages, and that he had reaped considerable benefit from the practice, in more ways than one; particularly in this, that those versions served as vouchers for the fidelity of one another, by their concurrence in every thing essential in that book; for when it was considered that the translators were not only men of different nations, but of hostile sects, Roman Catholics, church of England-men, Lutherans, Calvinists, Remonstrants, &c. their perfect harmony on all material points, is the best pledge we could desire of their veracity.

Of nearly the same kind and consequence have been the fears which even judicious men have entertained about the publication of the various readings of the Scriptures. These readings are tremendous only, when considered in a general view, and when we are told of the number they amount to. Nothing serves more to undeceive us, than to consider them in detail, and fairly examine those collections. I will acknowledge, for one, that I believe I should not have been easily persuaded till I made the experiment, that the authority of Scripture could be so little injured by them. The actual collection is, therefore, of great consequence, for satisfying candid and reasonable

men, that there is nothing in them so formidable, as the vague and general representations of their number and weight would lead men to conclude. Now, if such a man as Dr. Whitby, a man of distinguished learning and abilities, was alarmed at Mill's publication, as dangerous to the cause, not only of Protestantism, but of Christianity itself; we need not be surprised, that men of inferior talents, and less acquainted with the science of criticism, should look on the edition of the Old Testament by Kennicott, or of the New by Mill, or by Wetstein, as, at least, a very hazardous experiment. Yet, now that the experiment has been made, is there any appearance of those evils which have been dreaded from it? I am not sensible that there is. It is true, that Kennicott's publication of the Old Testament is so recent, that we have scarcely yet had time to discover its consequences; but if we may judge from the reception given to the New, we have no ground to fear them. Mill's work has been now in the hands of the Public for more than half a century, and Wetstein's for not much less. Yet it is not in my power to discover that, in the judgment of any reasonable man, or even in the judgment of the people, the cause of Christianity has suffered by these publications. I know that the most enlightened readers have judged them to be, in many respects, of service to the cause: and the opinion of the most enlightened, where there is no interference of secular motives, or of violent measures, will always prove at last the opinion of the generality.

Soon after Mill's edition appeared, which was about the beginning of the present century, the various readings of the New Testament became a topic for declamation to sceptics and freethinkers. There needed but a little time, in which men might canvass those variations, to convince every person who reflected, that there was nothing terrible in the case. Accordingly, he would now be deemed but a sorry advocate for the infidel hypothesis, who should have recourse to an argument which, if allowed to have any validity, would subvert our belief in all history whatever, as well as in that of the Gospel; for the writings of the Old and New Testament have not been exposed to more hazards from transcribers, than other ancient writings. Now, if any one should say, We can believe nothing in ancient history, on account of the variations to be found in the different editions and manuscripts of the different authors, no man of common sense would think him fit to be argued with. Yet there is one reason (without recurring to a miraculous interposition) to think, that we have more security of a faithful transmission of the Scriptures, than of any composition merely human. The supposed sacredness of the former, serves as a guard to them, and makes at least the greater part of transcribers afraid to take those freedoms with them which they would, without scruple, take with other writings. The excessive, nay, even superstitious, scrupulosity, which has given rise to so many absurdly literal versions of Scripture, is a strong presumption of the truth of what I say.

Those who consider religion as no other than a political engine, have reason, I own, to be alarmed. But those, on the contrary, who are persuaded that the religion of Jesus is founded in truth, and consequently divine, are inexcusable in their fears of canvassing it as much as possible. It is falsehood, not truth; it is guilt, not innocence, which studiously excludes the light, and flies examination. This our reason teaches; this our religion also teaches. *For whosoever doth evil, saith our Lord¹⁴, hateth the light, and shunneth it, lest his deeds should be detected. But he who obeyeth the truth, cometh to the light, that it may be manifest that his actions are agreeable to God.* Fears of this kind, in these latter ages (for from the beginning they were not), originated with the Romanists. The Protestants thought they saw clearly the reason of their apprehensions on this subject, and were not surprised at them. The measures employed by the party were all of a piece, and not badly suited to the end they had in view. Such were their *index expurgatorius*, their inquisitions, their licensers of books, their prohibitions, and other methods, for discouraging translations of the Scriptures, and for preventing the people's becoming acquainted with them. Of such measures the secret springs, as well as the manifest tendency, furnished ample matter of declamation to the adversaries of the Romish establishment.

It is not with pleasure that I add, but impartiality obliges me, for it is too true, that when

¹⁴ Jo. iii. 20, 21.

matters in any place took such a turn, as to throw the secular power into the hands of any party of such adversaries ; those of that party too often betrayed a propensity to recur to some of the measures they had before so universally and so loudly reprobated. We may, however, now, with some confidence, affirm, that it is rather too late a period in the age of the world to think of such odious expedients. By the invention of printing, and by the many discoveries and improvements which have extended the intercourse of nations, the acquisition of knowledge is, at present, so much facilitated and accelerated, in all civilized countries, that it will not be checked in its progress, nor will truth be overborne, by those expedients which were found fully sufficient for the purpose formerly. Nay, so evident is this become, that even that formidable power, which so long made ignorance a principal engine of government, seems compelled, at length, to shift her ground, and to appear among the foremost in patronizing what must conduce to the furtherance of knowledge.

It is little more than two centuries since the authenticity of the Vulgate version was formally affirmed, by a decree of the council of Trent. Immediately after that sentence, it appears to have been the prevalent opinion of zealous Romanists, that that translation ought to be considered as inspired, and consequently as absolutely faultless. On this account, the champions of the party did not hesitate to exalt it far above the original, which, though they acknowledged to have been inspired, they affirmed to have been, since

that time, miserably corrupted, in passing through the hands of collators and copists. In about a century after, how much more moderate the opinions, even of Romanists, were become, appears sufficiently from what we are informed of, on this subject, in Simon's Critical History. The high style, so common with theologians, and former controvertists, was heard no more. All moderate and judicious Romanists were ashamed of it. The prevalent opinion of such was then, what no reasonable Protestant will dissent from at this day, that, in every thing essential to the faith and practice of a Christian, it was a good version, and might be safely used. "Opinionum commenta delet dies." Let not the hand of power interfere; let there be neither bribes nor terrors, to bias the mind on either side; and men of the most opposite factions will soon become reasonable, and learn to understand one another. Free and fair discussion will ever be found the firmest friend to truth. At the time I speak of, the most moderate of the Roman Catholic party were, however, convinced that, in deference to the council's declaration, every true son of the church, who, for the use of the people, purposed to translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, ought to translate from the Vulgate version only. What, then, would those people have thought of a new translation into Latin, by one of their own priests, from the original Hebrew and Greek? They had some specious grounds, I acknowledge, for considering it as presumptuous, at least in the appearance which it has, of setting up the opinion of an indi-

vidual, in opposition to the declared judgment of the church. Yet in little more than half a century after the publication of the *Critical History*, another priest of the oratory undertook, and, with the pope's approbation, executed, a new translation of the *Old Testament* from the original into Latin, in which he corrects the errors of the *Vulgate*, with as much freedom as any candid Protestant could have done. Is there not reason, then, to say, that Rome seems to have changed her measures? How great was the encouragement which was given lately by the most eminent personages in that church, to the labours of an English Protestant, who undertook to give the Public a more correct edition of the *Hebrew Scriptures*, with the various readings, than the Christian world had enjoyed before?

But if Rome, from whatever motive it may arise, shall now, at length, judge it proper to contribute to the advancement of knowledge, and assist in furnishing the world with light and information; is it incumbent on Protestants, in opposition to all their former maxims, to do their utmost to withhold the light, and involve matters, as much as possible, in 'darkness? Might it not, in that case, be justly concluded, that they were actuated, not by the love of truth, but by the spirit of faction; and that they had become, at last, enemies to the light, finding, upon further inquiry, that the light was no friend to their cause? As no judicious Protestant can seriously think that there is ground for suspecting this, let not any one act as if he suspected it. If there

were ground for suspicion, this itself would be an additional reason for inquiry ; unless we are absurd enough to be more attached to a sect than to truth ; and to have more of that bigotry, and implicit faith, which are of the essence of superstition, than we have of genuine religion, which is ever found a reasonable service, and as completely amiable as the other is hateful.

Yet, is there not, even in some who are the friends of truth, and the friends of freedom, who, in religion, as in other matters, would give scope to inquiry and communication ; a sort of jealousy, on the article of translation, which makes them less equitable, less candid, judges, in regard to it, than in regard to any other matter that comes under their discussion ? They are jealous for the honour of the common version ; and though they are far from ascribing any supernatural power to the translators, they are afraid of the detection of any error which might make that version sink in the opinion of the people. ‘ This,’ say they, ‘ could not be productive of a good effect, either on the faith of the nation, or on their practice ; for, as the people cannot be supposed nice in distinguishing ; their Bible, and their religion, are to them the same thing. By discrediting the one, you injure the other ; and, by introducing questions about the proper rendering of a passage, you weaken the effect of the whole.’ As there is some plausibility in this method of arguing, I beg leave to offer a few more thoughts on the subject.

In every question relating to fact, where experience may be had, our safest recourse is to experience. Since the beginning of the sixteenth century, many Latin translations of the Bible, of very different characters, have been published. Can we justly say that, by means of these, the authority of Scripture, among those who do not understand the original, but are readers of those versions, has been weakened, and scepticism has been promoted? I do not think that, with any shadow of reason, this can be asserted. If people will but reflect, they will soon be sensible, that it is not among the readers of Scripture, either in the original, or in translations, that those evils chiefly abound. But there are many other species of reading, and many other causes to be traced, by which the effects above mentioned may be amply accounted for. To me it is evident, that of all sorts of reading and study, that of the Scriptures is the most innocent of those evil consequences. So the sacred writers, themselves, have thought, by whom this reading is often and warmly recommended, and not only reading the Scriptures, but searching into them, and meditating on them. Now, those who seriously comply with these injunctions, will never reject any aid by which they may be enabled to discover what lies deeper than the surface; so, also, have thought those pious men celebrated in Scripture, as having drawn much profit and delight from this exercise. I would not say so much for the reading of theological controversy; yet I would not that men, who liked this species of reading, were restrained from

using it. The accidental bad consequences which may accrue to individuals, from any literary pursuit, are of no consideration, compared with the general advantage resulting from the liberty of search, and free communication of knowledge. No person would think it better for the world that all men were enslaved, because some men make a very bad use of their freedom.

On the first publication of Erasmus' translation of the New Testament into Latin, much offence was taken by many, and dismal apprehensions were entertained of the hurt it would do to the cause of religion and Christianity. Even men who were esteemed both moderate and judicious, seemed to think that it was, at least, a hazardous experiment. The experiment, however, has been tried, not only by him, but by several others since his time. Yet there is not one, as far as I can learn, who has pretended to deduce from that, or any other translation, the irreligion and incredulity of the times.

To come to our own case; Have the attempts which have been made in this island, I may almost say, since the days of Wickliff, to translate the Scriptures into English, ever been found to lessen their authority? I have not heard this affirmed by any body. Yet every new version altered, and pretended to correct, many things in those which had preceded. But whatever may be the private judgment of individuals, concerning the comparative merit of the different translations, we cannot discover any traces of evidence, that their number did, in the smallest degree,

derogate from the veneration for holy writ generally entertained by the people. Against the common translation, in use at present, which was made and authorized in the beginning of the reign of James the First, there were precisely the same exceptions taken, founded in the like apprehensions of pernicious consequences. Whoever will consult the preface of that translation, and read the paragraph which is titled on the margin, *The speeches and reasons both of our brethren and of our adversaries against this work*; will be surprised to find how much they coincide with what has been thrown out, of late, against any new attempt of the same kind. It is remarkable that, from the days of Jerom to the present, the same terrible forebodings have always accompanied the undertaking, and vanished on the execution, inso-much that the fatal effects predicted, have never afterwards been heard of.

Now, to take the matter in another view; the cause assigned is nowise adequate to the effect. If the different ways of rendering one passage may make the unlearned doubtful with regard to the meaning of that passage, the perfect harmony of the different interpreters, as far as regards the sense, in many more passages; nay, I may justly say, in every thing that can be considered as essential in the history and doctrine, serves as the strongest confirmation of these in particular. The different translators are like so many different touchstones. Those truths which can stand such numerous trials, are rendered quite indubitable. I know not any, even of the common people,

that are possessed of an ordinary measure of understanding, who need to be told, that it is in the meaning, and not in the sound, that the doctrine of the Gospel lies : or, as the English translators have well expressed it : “ Is the kingdom of God “ become words or syllables ? Why should we “ be in bondage to them, if we may be free ? ” When people find those translations, though differing in words, yet, in every thing material, agreeing in sense, they prove to them, as was hinted before, like so many different witnesses, each in his own style, and in his own manner, attesting the same things, the great truths of our religion. They are witnesses, who perfectly agree in the import of their testimony : their differences in expression, far from derogating, in the judgment of any sensible reader, from their veracity, serve to establish it, and, consequently, prove confirmations of the facts attested. Various translations are, therefore, upon the whole, much better calculated for confirming, than for weakening, the faith of the unlearned.

Has the margin, in the English Bible, which, in a very great number of passages, gives every reader his choice of different translations, ever been found to endanger the faith of the people ? or, has it ever been suggested to have the same tendency with the arguments of deists ? Yet what should more readily, upon the principles of those gentlemen, with whom I am arguing, have produced this effect, than the confession (for their margin manifestly implies no less) of those learned men who were employed in the work, of the nu-

merous doubts which they had to encounter in the execution. They have honestly told their doubts, and, as far as I know, were never suspected of having done any hurt to the cause, by this ingenuous conduct. On the other hand, I am sorry to observe men of knowledge, discernment, and probity, appearing in support of measures which seem to proceed on the supposition, that a sort of disingenuous policy must be used with the people, for the defence of the truth. However necessary dissimulation and pious frauds, as they are called, may be for the support of false, I have never seen them of any service to true, religion. If not treacherous, they are dangerous, allies, at the best.

That one version expresses the sentiment more intelligibly, more perspicuously, or more emphatically, than another, will indeed occasion its being read with more pleasure, and even more profit; but it will never, on that account, be considered, by any, as giving a contradictory testimony. Yet it is such opposition of evidence that is the only circumstance which can affect the veracity of holy writ, and, consequently, the credit given to it by the people. And surely, whatever can, on the contrary, be rendered conducive to the emolument of the reader, cannot be prejudicial to the cause of religion, or disrespectful to the word of God, which does not consist in the words of any translation, but in the dictates of the divine Spirit.

The words of a translation that has long been in common use, have an advantage, of which they

cannot be of a sudden divested. The advantage results from this very circumstance, that it has been long in general use, and men are familiarized to its expressions. But, notwithstanding this, it may have considerable faults; it may, in several places, be obscure; and, though it should very rarely convey a false sense; it may be often ambiguous. In this case, a new version will be of great utility, if it were but for rendering the old more intelligible. For my part, I shall think my labour more than sufficiently recompensed, if, by the pious and the impartial, I shall be judged to express no extravagant opinion, and to form no presumptuous hope, when I say, in the words which Erasmus employed on a similar occasion: “Illa [Vulgata editio] legatur in scholis, canatur in templis, citetur in concionibus, nullus obstat. Illud ausim polliceri, quisquis hanc nostram domi legerit, suam rectius intellecturus¹⁵.”

Some, perhaps, are ready to interpose, ‘If translations were to be used only as private helps for understanding the scriptures, as commentaries and paraphrases are used, they would not be objected to: but what has alarmed the minds of men, is that, of late, some attempts have been made to persuade the public of the need there is for a new and more correct translation of the Bible, with the sanction of the higher powers, for the use of churches.’ As to any project of this kind, I can say very little, as I know not, in particular, what is projected: at the same

¹⁵ Erasm. in Apolog.

time I must acknowledge that, in the general view, it appears to me a very delicate point. To establish a version of Scripture by human authority, to be used by the people (without any regard had to their sentiments) in the public service of God, to the express exclusion of every other version, is a measure, about the propriety of which, at any time, I am far from being satisfied. The public use of particular translations of the Bible in the churches, Oriental and Occidental, for many centuries, took its rise, solely, from the general use in private: and, to this private use, no doubt, the favourable opinion of the pastors, such, especially, as were eminent for piety and learning, greatly contributed. But then, the effect was produced gradually and tacitly; in consequence of which, it appeared the result of the people's free choice, though not formally declared, well enough understood. It was in this way, certainly, that the old Italic first came into use in the Latin church; and it was in this way, from the growing predilection of the people, that the present Vulgate came at length to supplant it. It was fortunate for the success of Jerom's version, that no sanguine patron stood forth to push it into notice, and that no law was made commanding its reception, and prohibiting the public use of the Italic. Though men's opinions and attachments, even in matters which do not so deeply affect them as religion, cannot, at the command of a superior, be changed in a moment, the same effect will often, by proper means, be produced in a gentle and gradual manner. When the Italic

was first introduced, there was probably no other Latin translation of any account. In consequence of this, and of that desire of religious instruction, which universally animated the primitive Christians, they would receive it with joy. To read it to them, would be highly to gratify them; for we ought to reflect, that books were then matters of very difficult acquirement, compared to what they are now. But when the introduction of one book was the dispossession of another, to which they had been long accustomed, and were, from habit, warmly attached, the case was very different. Yet even this effect, which, it is probable, would not have been produced by stronger measures, was silently, and (as it were) imperceptibly, brought about by time. If, in some places, tumults were occasioned by the change, this, I suspect, when impartially examined, will be found imputable, more to the rashness and imprudence of the pastors, than to any want of docility in the people. Immediately after the Reformation, the opportunity was very favourable for procuring, among those who favoured the measures of the Reformers, a welcome reception to any version of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, which had the approbation of the heads of the party. If gratified in the thing chiefly wanted, they would not be critical as to the mode of introduction; and if, from the changes in their rulers, there had been some changes in relation to the Scriptures to be read in the congregation; what was established, in some places, was of so short continuance, that

the mind could hardly be said to be preoccupied by it.

But the case, at present, is widely different. Learning is in more hands. Critics are multiplied. The press is open; and every cavil, as well as every argument, is quickly circulated. Besides, the prepossession, in favour of the translation to which we have been so long habituated, is, at this day, very strong. Add to all this, that the religious, as well as the civil, rights of mankind were never better understood; the genuine principles of toleration had never greater influence. How, then, should we be affected, upon hearing that we are commanded, under pains and penalties, by our superiors, to read, and cause to be read in our churches, such a particular translation of the Bible only, and never more to admit into the sacred service, that version to which we have been hitherto, all our lives, accustomed, and for which we have contracted a high veneration. For my part, I will not dissemble the matter; I should think such a measure exceedingly incongruous to the spirit of that religion which the legislators, perhaps, intended to serve by it; and no less unseasonable, in respect of the age and country wherein we live. I perfectly agree with Tertullian, that religion, and coercion of any kind, are utterly incompatible. “*Hu-*“*mani juris et naturalis potestatis est, unicuique*“*quod putaverit, colere.*” Again: “*Nec reli-*“*gionis est cogere religionem, quæ sponte suscipi*“*debeat, non vi.*” I cordially subscribe to the sentiment of Lactantius, who deems it essential

to the value of every thing in religious service, in respect both of the object, and of the mode, that it be voluntary : “ Nihil est tam voluntarium quam religio, in qua si animus sacrificantis aversus est, jam sublata, jam nulla est.” Nor does it make any difference in the nature of the thing, whether the power that would compel us, be called civil or ecclesiastical.

But, is there nothing, then, which can, with propriety, be attempted by the higher powers, spiritual or temporal, for promoting the success of an accurate translation of the Bible ? The utmost which, in my judgment, can be done, if such a version should, in any future period, be offered to the Public, is to remove the obstructions which those powers have heretofore raised to prevent its introduction, and to permit, not command, the use of it, wherever it shall be found agreeable to the people, and judged, by the pastors, to be edifying. In the reign of Christian charity, which subsisted in times truly primitive and apostolical, it was not necessary that the limits of jurisdiction and authority should be so accurately ascertained, as afterwards, when love began to give place to ambition and secular prospects. Esteem and love are unsuspecting. In such a state of things, the opinion of no persons would go so far with the congregation, as that of their pastors ; nor would the pastors know any motive so powerful, as that of contributing to the edification of the people. ‘ But,’ it will be objected, ‘ to leave things in this manner, ‘ would appear like giving a sanction to different

‘ translations at the same time.’ If it should, I can perceive no absurdity in such a sanction ; no evil consequence that would follow from it. In fact, would it be any more, with respect to the whole Bible, than that which has long obtained in England, with regard to one considerable book, the Psalms, of which two very different versions, one in the Bible, the other in the Common Prayer, have equally the sanction of the higher powers? Are the people ignorant of this difference? Those who know any thing of the religion of the country, who read their Bible at home, and attend the service of the church, know it perfectly. Yet I have not heard that any private Christian was scandalized at it ; much less, that any one pretended to deduce, from this cause, the libertinism and infidelity of the times. Yet, in no part of Scripture would the people have so many opportunities of remarking the variations, as in that book, which they hear in church not seldomer than twelve times a year. So much cannot be said of any other part of the sacred volume, the New Testament being read over only thrice a year, and the Old Testament but once. If the people were so easily alarmed, as some seem to imagine, how has it happened, that the striking difference between the two authorized translations above mentioned, have not, long ere now, raised a clamour, either against the common translation, or against the Common Prayer ?

I should not have thought it necessary to say any thing on this head, if the subject had not been started, of late, and warmly agitated (I believe

with the best intentions on both sides), by some learned and worthy men. As my sentiments, on the subject, do not entirely coincide with those of either party, I thought it incumbent to add the explanation now given. The publishing of a new translation is not to be considered as implying a condemnation of any that preceded. This was objected to those employed by James the First, in preparing the translation used at present; and the reply which those translators made to their opponents in this business, as it had served Jerom before them, and served them, will equally serve me, or any translator, who shall afterwards bestow his time and labour in the same way. "We answer them," say they, "with St. Hierom, *Do we condemn the ancient? In no case; but, after the endeavours of them that were before us, we take the best pains we can in the house of God.* As if he said, Being provoked, by the example of the learned, that lived before my time, I have thought it my duty to assay whether my talent, in the knowledge of the tongues, may be profitable, in any measure, to God's church, lest I should seem to have laboured in them in vain, and lest I should be thought to glory in men (although ancient) above that which was in them." So said those worthy men, who, as they did not think themselves precluded from making improvements on the valuable labours of their predecessors, show, sufficiently, that they did not consider their own labours as superseding all attempts at still farther

improvements, by those who should come after them.

The due consideration of the progressive state of all human knowledge and art, will ever be unfriendly to the adoption of any measure which seems to fix a barrier against improvement, and to say to science, *Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther.* And if, in matters merely of science, such measures would prove hurtful, how much more in any thing wherein religion is concerned? My opinion, therefore, on this question, I freely acknowledge, favours the removal of all legal restraints, as much as possible, and not barely the change of the object. Indeed, this will be found the natural result of the argument, as it has heretofore been conducted. There is not a topic, which the present adversaries of an improved translation in English employ now, which was not, with the same plausibility, employed against Jerom's Latin translation, called the Vulgate, at present in universal use in the Latin church, and which was not also employed against the English translation of James the First, that very version for which our adversaries, on this article, now so strenuously contend. On the other hand, there was not any plea, which Jerom urged in support of his attempt, or which the English translators urged in support of theirs, that will not equally serve the purpose of any present or future well-meant attempt of the like kind, and, consequently, that does not strike against every measure which might effectually preclude any such attempt in time to come.

There are only two differences, in point of circumstances, between us and the inhabitants of this island, in the beginning of the last century, which impartiality obliges me to mention, and which (as they render more delicacy requisite in these days, than was necessary in those), if attended to, may prevent men from concluding too hastily, that those measures cannot fail of success now, which have succeeded formerly. Though some versions had been publicly authorized before that of James the First, none of them had been of near so long standing as that which is in use at present; and, consequently, the people's attachment to any one of them, was not so much strengthened by habit, as the present attachment to the English Bible may be supposed to be. An alteration, therefore, in respect of the public use, might be a much more difficult attempt now than it was then. The other difference arises from the consideration, that the spirit of liberty is much higher, at present, in the nation, than it was at that period; the rights of conscience are better understood, and the absurdity, as well as tyranny, of employing coercion, in matters of religion, are almost universally acknowledged.

All these considerations, whilst they give the utmost encouragement to the study of biblical criticism, show sufficiently, in a matter which so nearly affects the rights of conscience, the danger of all measures that can be justly accounted compulsory. For my own part, it is enough for me, that common sense assures me, that, if God condescends to speak to us mortals, it is our

duty to attend to what he says; and if, in any writing, he has revealed his will to us, it is our duty carefully to read that writing, and do our utmost rightly to understand it. The language of the Christian revelation, we quickly see, concurs with that of reason, in enjoining this practice; nay, it excites us still more strongly, by the example it sets before us, of those who have found much comfort and improvement in it. Can I require stronger motives to induce me to make God's word the subject of my study and meditation, day and night? And if I have reason to think that, by the blessing of Heaven, I have been, in some measure, successful in this application of my time, does not our common Christianity, one of the great commandments of which is, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, oblige me, for the benefit of others, to communicate any lights I may have received from this exercise? When they are communicated, I have discharged a Christian duty. The reception will be such as it pleases Providence to give them.

Though, in these volumes, I have not affirmed any thing, as my opinion, which did not at the time, and does not still, appear to me probable; and though many things, in them, appear certain, I desire nothing to be admitted, by the reader, upon my affirmation: my wish is, that every thing may be candidly and deliberately examined; that my reasons, which I commonly give, where the subject requires it, may be impartially weighed, and the opinion adopted, or rejected, as the reader, on due reflection, shall find cause. If to

make proselytes by the sword, is tyranny in rulers, to resign our understanding to any man, and receive, implicitly, what we ought to be rationally convinced of, would be, on our part, the lowest servility. Now, *tyranny* and *servility*, how much soever adapted to the genius of worldly domination, are by no means suited to the heavenly character of Christ's kingdom. The only means the Gospel itself permits us to employ, for promoting this spiritual power, is *persuasion*, which operates upon the understanding, and, by it, upon the will and affections: the great engine of secular dominion is *force*, which, without regarding the understanding, will, or affections, lays hold of the body. The language of our Lord to his hearers was, *If any man will come under my guidance; Ει τις ΘΕΛΕΙ οπισω μου ελθειν.* Nothing is obtruded or forced upon the unwilling. Now, as the great source of the infidelity of the Jews, was a notion of the temporal kingdom of the Messiah, we may justly say, that the great source of the corruption of Christians, and of their general defection, foretold by the inspired writers, has been an attempt to render it, in effect, a temporal kingdom, and to support and extend it by earthly means. This is that spirit of Antichrist, which was so early at work, as to be discoverable even in the days of the Apostles.

Every thing, therefore, here, is subjected to the test of Scripture and sound criticism. I am not very confident of my own reasonings. I am sensible that, on many points, I have changed my opinion, and found reason to correct what I had

judged formerly to be right. The consciousness of former mistakes, proves a guard to preserve me from such a presumptuous confidence in my present judgment, as would preclude my giving a patient hearing to whatever may be urged, from reason or Scripture, in opposition to it. TRUTH has been, in all my inquiries, and still is, my great aim. To her I am ready to sacrifice every personal consideration; but am determined not, knowingly, to sacrifice her to any thing. To Lucian's advice to the historiographer, *Μονη θυτειον τη αληθεια*, which I have inscribed in the title, it is my intention sacredly to adhere.

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in approximately 20 horizontal lines.

Preliminary Dissertations.

DISSERTATION THE FIRST.

Observations on the language and idiom of the New Testament, on the diversity of style, and on the inspiration of the sacred writers.

PART I.

THE LANGUAGE AND IDIOM.

IF the words and phrases employed by the Apostles and Evangelists, in delivering the revelation committed to them by the Holy Spirit, had not been agreeable to the received usage of the people to whom they spoke, the discourses, being unintelligible, could have conveyed no information, and consequently would have been no revelation to the hearers. Our Lord and his Apostles, in publishing the Gospel, first addressed themselves to their countrymen the Jews; a people who had, many ages before, at different periods, been favoured with other revelations. To those ancient Jewish Revelations, now collected into one volume, Christians give the name of the Old Testament; and thereby distinguish them from those

apostolical and evangelical writings, which, being also collected into one volume, are called the New Testament. In the latter dispensation, the divine authority of the former is presupposed and founded on. The knowledge of what is contained in that introductory revelation, is always presumed in the readers of the New Testament, which claims to be the consummation of an economy of God for the salvation of man; of which economy the Old Testament acquaints us with the occasion, origin, and early progress. Both are therefore intimately connected. Accordingly, though the two Testaments are written in different languages, the same idiom prevails in both; and in the historical part at least, nearly the same character of style.

§ 2. As the writings of the Old Testament are of a much earlier date, and contain an account of the rise and first establishment, together with a portion of the history of the nation to whom the Gospel was first promulged, and of whom were all its first missionaries and teachers, it is thence unquestionably that we must learn, both what the principal facts, customs, doctrines, and precepts are, that are alluded to in the apostolical writings, and what is the proper signification and extent of the expressions used. Though the New Testament is written in Greek, an acquaintance with the Greek classics (that is, with the writings of profane authors in that tongue in prose and verse) will not be found so conducive to this end, as an acquaintance with the ancient Hebrew Scrip-

tures. I am far from denying that classical knowledge is, even for this purpose, of real utility; I say only, that it is not of so great utility as the other. It is well known that the Jews were distinguished by all Pagan antiquity, as a nation of the most extraordinary and peculiar manners; as absolutely incapable of coalescing with other people, being actuated, especially in matters where religion or politics were thought to be concerned, by the most unrelenting aversion to every thing foreign, and the most violent attachment to every thing national. We cannot have a clearer evidence of the justness of this character, than their remaining to this day a distinct people, who, though they have been for many ages scattered over the face of the earth, have never yet been blended in any country with the people amongst whom they live. They are, besides, the only wandering nation that ever existed, of which this can be affirmed.

§ 3. BEFORE the tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned from captivity in Babylon to the land of their fathers, their language, as was inevitable, had been adulterated, or rather changed, by their sojourning so long among strangers. They called it Hebrew, availing themselves of an ambiguous name¹.

¹ *Hebrew* was ambiguous, as it might denote either the language spoken on the other side of the river (that is *Euphrates*, which is commonly meant when no river is named) or the language of the people called *Hebrews*. Preface to Matthew's Gospel, § 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

It is accordingly always called Hebrew in the New Testament. This, though but a small circumstance, is characteristic of the people, who could not brook the avowal of changing their language, and adopting that of strangers, even when they could not avoid being conscious of the thing. The dialect which they then spoke might have been more properly styled Chaldee, or even Syriac, than Hebrew. But to give it either of these appellations, had appeared to them as admitting what would always remind both themselves and others of their servitude. After the Macedonian conquests, and the division which the Grecian empire underwent among the commanders, on the death of their chief, Greek soon became the language of the people of rank through all the extensive dominions which had been subdued by Alexander. The persecutions with which the Jews were harassed under Antiochus Epiphanes, concurring with several other causes, occasioned the dispersion of a great part of their nation throughout the provinces of Asia Minor, Assyria, Phenicia, Persia, Arabia, Lybia, and Egypt; which dispersion was in process of time extended to Achaia, Macedonia, and Italy. The unavoidable consequence of this was in a few ages, to all those who settled in distant lands, the total loss of that dialect which their fathers had brought out of Babylon into Palestine. But this is to be understood with the exception of the learned who studied the oriental languages by book. At length a complete version of the Scriptures of the Old Testament was made into Greek;

a language which was then, and continued for many ages afterwards, in far more general use than any other. This is what is called the Septuagint or version of the *Seventy* (probably because approved by the Sanhedrim), which was begun (as has been said) by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, for the use of the Alexandrian library. At first no more than the Pentateuch was translated, which was soon followed by a version of the other books. This is doubtless the first translation that was attempted of the Sacred Writings.

§ 4. It will readily be imagined that all the Jews who inhabited Grecian cities, where the oriental tongues were unknown, would be solicitous to obtain copies of this translation. To excite in them this solicitude, patriotism would concur with piety, and indeed almost every motive that can operate upon men. In one view their Bible was more to them than ours is to us. It is religion alone, I may say, that influences our regard; whereas their sacred book contained not only their religious principles and holy ceremonies, but the whole body of their municipal laws². They contained an account of their political constitution, and their civil history, that part especially which is most interesting, the lives of their Patriarchs, and the gradual advancement of that family from which they gloried to be descended; the history of their establishment as a na-

² See Lowth, De Sacra Poësi Hebræorum, Præl. viii.

tion; the exploits, victories, and conquests of their ancestors; the lives and achievements of their kings and heroes, prophets and reformers. Nay, more, the Scriptures might also be justly considered as a collection of the writings, both prosaic and poetical, of all the most eminent authors their country had produced. A copy of such a version was therefore, in every view we can take of it, an inestimable treasure to every Jew who understood Greek, and could not read the original. And hence we may easily conceive that the copies would soon be greatly multiplied, and widely scattered.

§ 5. LET us attend to the consequences that would naturally follow. Wherever Greek was the mother-tongue, this version would come to be used not only in private in Jewish houses, but also in public in their schools and synagogues, in the explanation of the weekly lessons from the Law and the Prophets. The style of it would consequently soon become the standard of language to them on religious subjects. Hence would arise a certain uniformity in phraseology and idiom among the Grecian Jews, wherever dispersed, in regard to their religion and sacred rites, whatever were the particular dialects which prevailed in the places of their residence, and were used by them in conversing on ordinary matters.

§ 6. THAT there was, in the time of the Apostles, a distinction made between those Jews who used the Greek language, and the Hebrews, or those who spoke the language of Palestine and of

the territory of Babylon, which they affected to call Hebrew; is manifest from the Acts of the Apostles. There³ we are informed, that *there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration.* That those Grecians were Jews, is evident from the history: for this happened before Peter was specially called to preach the gospel to Cornelius and his family, who were the first fruits of the Gentiles to Christ. Besides, though the word *Grecian* made use of in our translation is synonymous with *Greek*, yet the term employed in the original is never applied in the New Testament to pagan Greeks, but solely to those Jews who had resided always or mostly in Grecian cities, and consequently whose common tongue was Greek. The Gentile Greeks are invariably called in Scripture *Ἕλληνες*, whereas the term used in the place quoted is *Ἑλληνισταί*, a word which even in classical authors does not mean Greeks, but *imitators of the Greeks, or those who write or speak Greek*; being a derivation from the word *ἑλληνίζειν*, *to speak Greek, or imitate the Greeks.* The term occurs only thrice in the New Testament, that is in two other passages of the Acts beside that now quoted. One of these is⁴ where we are told that Saul, also called Paul, after his conversion, being at Jerusalem, *disputed with the Grecians, προς τῆς Ἑλληνιστας*, who went about to slay him. This also happened before the conversion of Cornelius,

³ Acts, vi. 1, &c.

⁴ Acts, ix. 29.

and consequently before the Gospel was preached to any Gentile : but as at their festivals there was a general concourse of Jewish people at Jerusalem from all the parts of the world into which they were dispersed, a considerable number of those Hellenists or Grecizers, as in our idiom we should be apt to term them, must have been present on that occasion. It may be observed by the way, that the Syriac version, probably the oldest extant, which, in the two other passages, confounds ἑλληνισται with ἑλληνες, here marks the distinction, rendering the former by periphrasis, agreeably to the sense above given, *those Jews who knew Greek*. The only other passage is where we are told⁵, that some of those being Cypriots and Cyrenians, who were scattered abroad on the persecution that arose about Stephen, *spake unto the Grecians* (προς τας Ἑλληνιστας) at Antioch, *preaching the Lord Jesus*. Whether this was before or after the baptism of Cornelius, recorded in the foregoing chapter, is not certain : but one thing is certain, that it was before those disciples could know of that memorable event. Concerning the others who were in that dispersion, who were probably Hebrews, we are informed in the verse immediately preceding, that in all those places, Phenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, through which they went, they preached the word to none but Jews.

§ 7. THE learned Basnage makes a principal handle of this passage for supporting an opinion,

⁵ Acts, xi. 20.

which had been advanced before by Beza, that by the *Hellenists* is meant *the proselytes to Judaism*, they being contrasted here not with the *Hebrews*, but with the *Jews*. Mr. Bowyer⁶, on the contrary, thinks that, in the two former places referred to, the word *Hellenists* means proselytes; but in the last, where those so denominated are expressly distinguished from *Jews*, it can only mean *Heathen Greeks*. But, in answer to both, let it be observed that the word *Jew* was not always, in those days, used in the same sense. Most commonly indeed it referred to the nation, in which sense it was synonymous with *Israelite*. A man of Jewish extraction was not the less a *Jew*, because he was neither a native nor an inhabitant of *Judea*, and understood not a syllable of its language. Sometimes, however, it referred to the country, in which acceptance it belonged particularly to the inhabitants of *Judea* or *Palestine*, including those neighbouring regions where in the same tongue was spoken. That the *Samaritans* (though mortally hated as schismatics) were comprehended in this application of the term *Jew*, is evident from what we learn from the *Acts*⁷, where we are informed of their being converted by *Philip*, and receiving the gifts of the *Holy Spirit* by the hands of *Peter*, sometime before the conversion of *Cornelius*, the first fruits of the *Gentiles* to *Christ*. Nay sometimes, in a still more limited signification, it regarded only the inhabitants of the district belonging

⁶ Conjectures, *Acts* vi. 1.

⁷ *Acts*, viii. 5, &c.

to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which had anciently constituted the kingdom of Judah. In this sense we understand the word as used by the Evangelist John⁸, *After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry (Ιουδαία, Judea), because the Jews sought to kill him.* Yet Galilee was a part of Judea in the larger and even more common acceptance of the word, and the Galileans, of whom were the Apostles, were, in every sense except this confined one, Jews as well as the others. The same distinction is made between Judea and Galilee by Matthew⁹. It cannot be doubted therefore, that the term *Jews* in the passage under examination, ought to be understood in the second sense above mentioned, as equivalent to Hebrews.

A little attention to the case puts this conclusion beyond a doubt: Why should they, in preaching the Gospel, make a distinction between *Jews* and *proselytes*, persons who had received the seal of circumcision, and subjected themselves, without reserve, to the Mosaic yoke? The law itself made no distinction; nay, it expressly prohibited the people from making any. ¹⁰*When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one that is born in the land; for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One*

⁸ John, vii. 1.

⁹ Matth. ii. 22.

¹⁰ Exod. xii. 48, 49. See also Numb. xv. 14, 15, 16. 29.

law shall be to him that is home-born, and to the stranger that sojourneth among you. This last phrase (though sometimes used with greater latitude) became a common periphrasis for a proselyte. We find accordingly that though a question arose early in the church, and was for a time hotly agitated, concerning the lawfulness of admitting the uncircumcised to baptism (for such was Cornelius, though no idolater); there is no hint given that the smallest doubt was entertained concerning the admission of proselytes who had already embraced the Jewish ritual, and were circumcised. So far from it, that the keenest advocates for uniting Judaism with Christianity, insisted only that the Gentile converts might be circumcised, and compelled to join the observance of the law of Moses to their faith in Christ. Where, then, could be the difficulty of receiving those who were already disciples of Moses, and had been circumcised?—It will perhaps be retorted, “If the Christians could have no scruple to preach to proselytes, still less could they have to preach to those native Jews, who differed in nothing from their brethren in Palestine but in language.” True, indeed, they could have no scruple; but those who came at that time to Antioch, were not all qualified for preaching in Greek, for all had not the gift of tongues. And the historian has rendered it evident that the want of the language was the reason they did it not, having observed that those who came thither and preached to the Hellenists, were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, places where Greek was the prevailing tongue.

In regard to the murmuring mentioned in the sixth chapter, which gave rise to the appointment of deacons, nothing can be more improbable than Beza's hypothesis. The number of the proselytes of righteousness, as they are sometimes called, could not be great; for though several, like Cornelius, had been gained over from Paganism to the worship of the true God, few, comparatively, were induced to adopt the Mosaic ceremonies. Now converts of the first sort were still by the Jews accounted heathens, and had access to no part of the temple inaccessible to Gentiles. Of the Jewish proselytes, it was a part only that was converted to Christianity; and of that part, those who were both widows and indigent could not surely be a great proportion. Further, if by Hellenists be meant proselytes, where was the occasion for classing them separately from the Jews, or for so much as inquiring who was a Jew by birth, and who a proselyte? It was not agreeable, as we have seen, either to the spirit or to the letter of the law, to make so invidious, not to say odious, a distinction; and if not to the law, still less, if possible, to the Gospel. Whereas the distinction, on the other hypothesis, being founded on their using different languages, was not barely convenient, but necessary. They were classes of people who could not be addressed in the same tongue; and, for this reason, it was probably found expedient to employ different agents in supplying them. Certain it is, they were in the constant practice of assembling in different synagogues; for in Jerusalem

there were Greek synagogues for the accommodation of the Hellenists of different nations, who came thither either occasionally or to attend the great festivals, as well as Hebrew synagogues for the use of the natives. Such were most of those mentioned in the Acts¹¹; the Cyrenian synagogue and the Alexandrian,—the Cilician and the Asian.

That Nicolas, one of the deacons elected on that occasion, was a proselyte, is a circumstance of no moment in this question. If four, or even three of the seven, had been of that denomination, it might have been pleaded with some plausibility, that there must have been in this a design of destroying in the proselytes all suspicion of partiality. As it was, had it been they who murmured, it would have rather increased than diminished their jealousy, to find that they had gotten only one of their own class chosen for six of the other. This, therefore, must be considered as a circumstance merely accidental. As to that singular conceit of Vossius, that the Hellenists were those who favoured the doctrine of submission to a foreign yoke; as it is destitute alike of internal credibility and external evidence, it requires no refutation.

§ 3. So much for the distinction that obtained in those days between Hebrew Jews and Grecian Jews, or Hellenists; among the latter of whom, the version of the Seventy was in constant use. The Greek had been for ages a sort of universal

¹¹ Acts vi. 9.

language in the civilized world, at least among people of rank and men of letters. Cicero had with truth said of it¹², at the time when Rome was in her glory and Greece declining—“ *Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus: Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane continentur.*” This continued to be the case till the time of the publication of the Gospel, and for some centuries afterwards. As the Greek was then of all languages the best understood, and the most generally spoken throughout the empire, the far greater part of the New Testament, which contained a revelation for all mankind, was originally written in that tongue. I say, the far greater part, because many critics are of opinion that the Gospel of Matthew¹³ and the epistle to the Hebrews were originally written in that dialect of the Chaldee which was then the language of Jerusalem, and by Jewish writers called Hebrew. It must be remembered that all the penmen of the New Testament were Jews—the greater part Hebrews, not Hellenists: but whether they were Hebrews or Hellenists, as they wrote in Greek, the version of the Seventy would serve as a model in what concerned propriety of expression on religious subjects. It was, besides, the idiom which would be best understood by all the converts to Christianity from among their brethren the Jews, wheresoever scattered, and that whereby their writings would more perfectly harmonize with their own Scriptures, which the whole of that people had in so great

¹² Pro Archia Poeta.

¹³ See the Preface to that Gospel.

and deserved veneration; for let it be observed that, though the Jews afterwards came to lose entirely their respect for the Septuagint, and even to depreciate it as an unfaithful, as well as inaccurate, translation; this change of their sentiments was the mere effect of their disputes with the Christians, who, in arguing from it, went to the opposite extreme—considered it as the immediate work of inspiration—and, in every instance wherein it differed from the original Hebrew, with which they were unacquainted, gave it the preference, treating the latter as a compilation, which had been corrupted by the Jews, in spite to Christianity. But of the high esteem which this people once entertained for that version, particularly about the time of the publication of the Gospel, their own writers, Philo and Josephus, are the most unexceptionable witnesses.

§ 9. FROM the conformity and peculiarity in language above taken notice of, some critics, in order to distinguish the idiom of the Septuagint and New Testament from that of common Greek, have termed it Hellenistic; not with exact propriety, I acknowledge, if we regard the etymology of the word, but with justness sufficient for the purpose of characterising the peculiar phraseology of those writings. The disputes raised on this subject by Salmasius and some others are scarcely worth naming, as they will, upon examination, all be found to terminate in mere disputes about words. I readily admit, that this speciality of diction is properly not a peculiar language, nor

even a peculiar dialect, in the same sense as the *Attic*, the *Ionic*, the *Eolic*, and the *Doric*, are called different dialects; for there are in it no peculiarities in the inflexions of either nouns or verbs. In strictness of speech, the peculiarity does more properly constitute a difference of idiom, than either of language or of dialect. The phraseology is Hebrew, and the words are Greek. This singular manner in the ancient translators, is to be considered as partly intentional, and partly accidental: partly intentional, because, from the scrupulous, I may even say, superstitious, attachment of the Jews not only to the words, but to the letters and syllables, to every jot and tittle, of the original, they would be led to attempt a manner of translating so servilely literal, as is always incompatible with purity in the language into which the translation is made;—partly accidental, because, even without design, a person speaking or writing a foreign language, frequently mingles in his speech the idioms of his native tongue. One source of the peculiarities in idiom, may have arisen from this circumstance, that the translators, though Jews, were Alexandrians. In a language spoken, as Greek was then, in many distant countries, all independent of one another, there inevitably arise peculiarities in the acceptations of words in different regions. Perhaps we ought to impute to this, that sometimes terms have been adopted by the Seventy which appear to us not the most apposite for rendering the import of the original, such as *διαθηκη* for *ברית* *berith*, and *ὁσιος* for *חסיד* *chasid*. But whatever be in this,

the habit which the Apostles and Evangelists had of reading the Scriptures, and hearing them read, whether in the original, or in the ancient version, would, by infecting their style, co-operate with the tendency which, as natives of Palestine, they would derive from conversation, to intermix Hebraisms and Chaldaisms in their writings.

§ 10. IT is not to be dissembled, that the sacred penmen of the New Testament have, especially in modern times, had some strenuous advocates, both among foreigners, and amongst our own countrymen, who have, in my opinion, with more zeal than judgment, defended their diction, as being, when judged by the rules of grammar and rhetoric, and the practice of the most celebrated writers in Greece, altogether pure and elegant. They seem to suspect, that to yield, even on the clearest evidence, a point of this nature, though regarding ornaments merely human and exterior, might bring dishonour on inspiration, or render it questionable. I cannot help thinking that these people must have very indistinct ideas on this subject, and may be justly said to incur the reproof which Peter, on a memorable occasion, received from his Master—that *they savour more the things of men than the things of God*¹⁴. Are words of any kind more than arbitrary signs? And may not the same be said with justice of phrases and idioms? Is there a natural fitness

¹⁴ Matth. xvi. 23.

in one word or phrase more than in another, for denoting the thing signified? Is not the connexion between sounds and ideas merely artificial—the result of human, though tacit conventions? With regard to those rules which constitute purity in the language of any country, what are they, in effect, but the conventions which have happened to obtain among the natives, particularly those of the higher ranks?—Vulgarisms, and foreign idioms, which may obtain among strangers, and those of the lower ranks, have no more natural unfitness to convey the sense which they that use them intend to convey by them, than the terms and phrases which, in consequence of the preference given by their superiors, may be regarded as elegancies. It may be as reasonably objected against our religion, that the persons by whom it was propagated, were chosen from what men, in high life, account the dregs of the people, as that the Holy Spirit should accommodate himself to the language of those who were actually chosen. Nay, language as well as dress being in fact no more than a species of mode, it may with as good reason be maintained that the ambassadors whom Christ sent for promulgating his doctrine, should have been habited like gentlemen, and men of fashion, as that they should have spoken the dialect of such. Splendid style had no more connexion with the purpose of their mission than splendid apparel. The cloth which they wore, how coarse soever, answered all the essential purposes of clothing; the same may be said of the language which they

spoke. And if it be argued, that good language would create greater respect to their persons, and closer attention to what they said, and consequently would contribute to its making a deeper impression ; as much may be affirmed, with truth, of a genteel appearance both of person and of dress. Nothing serves more powerfully to quash curiosity and expectation, and consequently to destroy attention, than such an external figure as generally accompanies poverty and ignorance, and suggests a total want of the advantages of education, and, more especially, of that indispensable advantage which the fashionable world calls *seeing good company*.

But these very disadvantages or defects, both in speech and in outward figure, are assigned by the inspired writers as the reason of God's preference, whose thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways. Paul argues, that the success of the preachers of the Gospel, in spite of the absence of those accomplishments in language then so highly valued, was an evidence of the divine power and energy with which their ministry was accompanied. He did not address them, he tells us¹⁵, *with the wisdom of words*—with artificial periods and a studied elocution, *lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect* ;—lest to human eloquence that success should be ascribed which ought to be attributed to the divinity of the doctrine, and the agency of the Spirit, in the miracles wrought in support of it. There is

¹⁵ 1 Cor. i. 17.

hardly any sentiment which he is at greater pains to enforce. He *used none of the enticing or persuasive words of man's wisdom*.—Wherefore?—*That their faith might not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God*¹⁶. Should I ask, What was the reason why our Lord Jesus Christ chose for the instruments of that most amazing revolution in the religious systems of mankind, men perfectly illiterate, and taken out of the lowest class of the people? your answer to this will serve equally for an answer to that other question—Why did the Holy Spirit choose to deliver such important truths in the barbarous idiom of a few obscure Galileans, and not in the politer and more harmonious strains of Grecian eloquence? I repeat it, the answer to both questions is the same—That it might appear, beyond contradiction, that the excellency of the power was of God, and not of man¹⁷.

¹⁶ 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

¹⁷ Those who desire to see this argument treated as it affects infidels (who make a handle of the badness of the style to discredit revelation), may consult the late Bishop of Gloucester's *Doctrine of Grace*, B. I. ch. viii, ix, and x. I here consider the question chiefly as affecting some well-meaning but mistaken Christians. It may be proper further to observe, that the opinion of the very acute and learned author of the work above mentioned, does not, on the subject of inspiration laid down in ch. vii., in every thing coincide with that here supported. A distinction is made by him, not only between the style and the sentiments, but between the sentiments of greater and those of less moment, in the several books. The latter distinction leads to a controversy which is quite foreign from my argument, and with which for that reason I have not meddled.

§ 11. THERE are some collateral purposes which Providence has effected by the same means. One is, that the writings of the New Testament carry, in the very expression and idiom, an intrinsic and irresistible evidence of their authenticity. They are such as, in respect of style, could not have been written but by Jews, and hardly even by Jews superior, in rank and education, to those whose names they bear. And what greatly strengthens the argument is that, under this homely garb, we find the most exalted sentiments, the closest reasoning, the purest morality, and the sublimest doctrine. The homeliness of their diction, when criticised by the rules of grammarians and rhetoricians, is what all the most learned and judicious of the Greek fathers frankly owned. And is it modest in us, petty critics of modern times, to pretend to be nicer judges of purity and elegance in the Greek language, than Origen and Chrysostom, whose native tongue it was; and who, besides, were masters of uncommon skill, as well as fluency, in that language? I have heard of a French critic who undertook to demonstrate that Aristotle did not understand Greek, nor Livy Latin. There is hardly an opinion so paradoxical or absurd as not to find some admirers. What wonder then that we should meet with people who esteem a Pfochinius and a Blackwall¹⁸ better judges of Greek than the

¹⁸ A. Blackwall, author of "The Sacred Classics defended and illustrated."

greatest orators among the Grecians, and maintain that Paul's style, in spite of his own verdict, is as classical as Plato's. The writings of the ancient Greeks have been rummaged for the discovery of words and phrases, which, in the import given them, might appear to resemble what has been accounted Hebraism or Syriasm in the New Testament. The success of such endeavours has been far from giving satisfaction to readers of discernment. It will readily be acknowledged, by the impartial, that several idioms in the New Testament have been mistaken for Oriental, which may be as truly denominated Grecian. But there remains a much larger number of those brought under that class, concerning which there can be no reasonable doubt¹⁹.

¹⁹ The very first words of the Gospel, *Βιβλος γενεσεως*, for *genealogy* or *lineage*, are one example amongst hundreds that might be produced. How many meanings are given to the word *σαρξ*, *flesh*, in that Sacred Volume, for which you will not find a single authority in any prophane writer? Beside the original meaning of the word universally admitted, it sometimes denotes the whole body considered as animated, as in Matth. xxvi. 41. *The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.*—This may indeed be thought to be of all the deviations from the proper sense, the most defensible on classical and rhetorical principles, being not an unnatural synecdoché of the part for the whole.—Secondly, It sometimes means a human being, as in Luke iii. 6. *All flesh shall see the salvation of God*;—sometimes, 3dly, a person's kindred collectively considered, as in Rom. xi. 14. *If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh*; sometimes, 4thly, any thing of an external or ceremonial nature,

§ 12. THE methods by which our opponents, on this article, support their hypothesis are, I say, unsatisfactory. There are such negligencies in the style, even of the best writers, as to render it unsafe to pronounce on the goodness of an expression which we have only once met with, though in a celebrated author. Much less ought a singular phrase found in one single classic, similar to an idiom frequent in the New Testament, to be accounted evidence that the idiom was in general, and approved, use, which always determines purity in every tongue. The sin-

as opposed to that which is internal and moral, as in Gal. iii. 3. *Having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?*—sometimes, 5thly, the sensitive part of our nature, the seat of appetite, as in 2 Cor. vii. 1. *Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit,* where there can be no doubt that the pollutions of the flesh must be those of the appetites, being opposed to the pollutions of the spirit or those of the passions. 6thly, and lastly, It is employed to denote any principle of vice and moral pravity of whatever kind. Thus among *the works of the flesh* (Gal. v. 19, 20, 21.) are numbered not only *adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, drunkenness, and revellings,* which all relate to criminal indulgences of appetite, but *idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, and murders,* which are manifestly vices of a different kind, and hold more of the diabolical nature than of the beastly. Now, for any of the six meanings above mentioned, except perhaps the first; as to which I will not be positive, we may defy those critics to produce classical authority. Yet no man accustomed to the oriental idiom, and the style of the sacred writers, can mistake the sense in any of the passages quoted.

gularity, in the one case, opposed to the frequency in the other, should lead us to a very different conclusion. The evidence cannot be more satisfactory which arises from a particular turn of expression occurring in some poetical work, and coinciding with an idiom current in the New Testament, which is written in prose. We know that the Greek poetry had a peculiar dialect, and many peculiar words; and that their poets were, by the laws of their versification, allowed a latitude, in this respect, with which their prose writers were not indulged: nor is there any thing that their critics more loudly condemn, as savouring of artifice and affectation, than what may be called a poetic phraseology in prose. Let it not be imagined that I think the sacred penmen chargeable with any thing affected or artificial in their phraseology. There is no character of style for which they are more distinguishable than the reverse. But what would be justly denominated artificial, affected, and foreign, in a native of Attica, might be the result of the most undesigning and natural simplicity, in an inhabitant of Palestine, because conformable to the idioms of his native language. Further, a strong resemblance, in an expression admitted to be classical, will not suffice for removing the charge of foreign idiom from the resembling but different expression. In most cases, nothing less than identity will serve²⁰. Recourse to synonyms, analogy,

²⁰ I shall illustrate this by an example in regard to which every English reader can with safety be more decisive than even

and etymology, is necessary and often successful in discovering the sense of an obscure expression, whereof nothing less than the use of good authors

men of literature are qualified to be in regard to an example taken from a dead language. In a letter during the late war from the captain of a French privateer to the magistrates of a seaport, demanding a contribution, and threatening in case of non-compliance to destroy the town, there was this expression, "I will *make* my duty." No Englishman, we are certain, would have expressed himself so, unless he had done it for a disguise. Yet I can easily conceive that a foreigner, who has learnt our language only by book, might speciously maintain, that the expression, so far from being a Gallicism, is unexceptionable English. "Is it not," he would argue, "common to say, I will *do* my duty? Now, if this expression be classical, where is the impropriety in substituting one synonymous word for another?" And to show that *do* and *make* are synonymous, he might urge, first, that in most other tongues one word serves for both. Thus each of them is rendered into Latin, *facere*; into Italian, *fare*; into French, *faire*. Secondly, though he had not found, in any English book, the identical phrase, to *make duty*, he could produce expressions in which there is an entire similarity. *To make court, to make obeisance*, are both good; nay, it strengthens the argument, that *to do obeisance*, is also used, in the same signification. Shakespear says, "What *make* they there?" which is equivalent to, "What *do* they there?" Dryden speaks of "the faults he had *made*;" though doubtless the more usual expression would have been "the faults he had *done*." Now, from the first principles of analogy, we are warranted to conclude, that if *making a fault* be proper to express *doing wrong, making a duty*, is proper to express *doing right*. All this is very plausible, and would, probably, be sufficient to convince most strangers, but would only extort a smile from an intelligent native, on whom a thousand such arguments could make no impression. Yet I will venture to affirm that, if there

will warrant the propriety or elegance. Sufficient evidence in the one case, is often no evidence in the other.

§ 13. BLACKWALL²¹ admits freely that there are many Hebraisms in the New Testament, at the same time asserting that they are real beauties, which add both vigour and ornament to the expression. In this opinion, if he was serious, I believe that, upon examination, we shall not be found to differ. Abstracting from that lowest kind of beauty in language, which results from its softness and harmony, considered as an object to the ear, every excellency of style is relative, arising solely from its fitness for producing, in the mind of the reader, the end intended

be no solidity in this reasoning, nine tenths of what has been so pompously produced, to show that the supposed Hebraisms of the New Testament are in the genuine idiom of the Greek tongue, are no better than arrant trifling. It was to triflers of this sort that Chrysostom said very appositely, *Ἴνα μη καταγελωμεθα οὕτω διαλεγόμενοι πρὸς Ἕλληνας, ἐπειδὴν ἡμῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄγων ἦν, καταγορωμεν ἀποστόλων ὡς ἀμαθῶν, ἢ γὰρ κατηγορία αὐτῆ ἐγκωμιον.* Chrys. Hom. 3. in 1 Cor. i. "That we may not render ourselves ridiculous, arguing thus with Grecians, for our dispute is with them; let us accuse the Apostles of being illiterate, for this accusation is an encomium." Origen goes still farther, and says, *Οὐκ ἀσυναίσθητοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι τυγχάνοντες τῶν ἐν οἷς προσκοπιτοῦσι, φαβῖν ἰδιωταὶ εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆ γνώσει.* Philoc. c. 4. "The Apostles, not insensible of their own defects, profess themselves to be of the vulgar in speech, but not in knowledge."

²¹ Sac. Class. Part I. Ch. 1.

by the writer. Now in this view it is evident, that a style and manner may, to readers of one denomination, convey the writer's sentiments with energy as well as perspicuity, which, to those of a different denomination, would convey them feebly, darkly, and, when judged by their rules of propriety, improperly. This I take to have been actually the case with the writers of the New Testament. I speak particularly of the historical books. I look upon the language of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as better adapted to the readers for whose use the Gospels and Acts were at first composed, than the language of Plato or Demosthenes would have been.

I should, at the same time, think it unreasonable to deny that the latter must have been more intelligible to an Athenian, and much more pleasing, nervous, and animated, than the former. Nay, if such a one had even denominated the idiom of the New Testament *barbarous*, I should not have thought it an unpardonable offence. The word indeed sounds harshly; but we know that, from the mouths of native Greeks, it could only mean that the idiom of that book is not conformable to the rules of their grammarians and rhetoricians, and to the practice of their writers of reputation; a concession which we may easily make them, without derogating, in the least, from the Apostles and Evangelists;—a concession which (as was observed before) the most learned and oratorical of the Greek fathers did not scruple to make. In such cases, it is evident, that a native

of common sense is a much better judge than a learned foreigner²².

§ 14. I EXPRESSED myself dubiously of Blackwall's seriousness in affirming that the Oriental idioms, with which the sacred authors abound, are highly ornamental to their compositions; because nothing can be plainer than that he is indefatigable in controverting their claims to the greater part of those ornaments. I cannot think he would have willingly injured them; yet it is impossible not to perceive, that he is at infinite pains, though on the most frivolous pretexts²³, to divest them of almost every beauty of this

²² Hardly any foreigner of the last century has been more conversant with English men and English books than *Voltaire*. Yet his knowledge of our language, on which I have been told he piqued himself not a little, has not secured him from blundering when he attempted to write it. In a letter to the Parisians, prefixed to his comedy *L'Ecossaise*, which he thought proper to introduce to the world as a translation, he quotes the following sentence as part of a letter he had received from the English author: "You have quite impoverished the character of Wasp; and you have blotted his chastisement at the end of the drama." An Englishman might have guessed what he meant by the first clause, but must have remained in total darkness about the second, if he had not explained himself by subjoining the translation. *Vous avez affaibli le caractere de Frelon; et vous avez supprime son chatiment a la fin de la piece.* An explanation not less necessary to many of his English readers than to his French.

²³ The following is a specimen, Vol. II. Part I. Ch. 2. § 2. "*Καταβολη κοσμου* in the sacred writers, seemed to some

sort ascribed to them by others! I desire only to restore to them the merit, of which he has not very consistently, though I believe with a pious intention, endeavoured to strip them. This critic did not consider that, when he admitted any Hebraisms in the New Testament, he, in effect, gave up the cause. That only can be called a Hebraism in a Greek book, which, though agreeable to the Hebrew idiom, is not so to the Greek. Nobody would ever call that a Scotticism which is equally in the manner of both Scots and English. Now, such foreign idioms as Hebraisms in Greek, Grecisms in Hebrew, or Latinisms in either, come all within the definition of barbarism, and sometimes even of solecism—words which have always something relative in their signification; that turn of expression being a barbarism or a solecism in one language, which is strictly proper in another—and I may add, to one set of hearers, which is not so to another. It is, then, in vain, for any one to debate about the application of the names *barbarism* and *solecism*.

To do so, is at best, but to wrangle about words, after admitting all that is meant by them. The Apostle Paul, less scrupulous, does not hesitate,

“ gentlemen conversant in these studies unexampled in the old Grecians. Indeed it is very rare; but it is found in the lofty Pindar (Nem. Od. 2.) *Καταβολαν ἱεραν αγωνων.*” A most extraordinary way of proving that the phrase *Καταβολη κοσμου* is not unexampled in the old Grecians. About the noun *Καταβολη* no doubt was ever made, nor was any doubt made about *Κοσμος*; the question was solely about the phrase.

by implication, to call every tongue barbarous to those who do not understand it. *If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be a barbarian to him that speaketh; and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me*²⁴. Nor does it make any difference, as appears from the whole of the Apostle's argument, even if what is spoken be spoken by the Spirit. Surely, with equal reason, we may say of those foreign idioms in any tongue, which render what is said unintelligible, or even obscure, to the natives, that, in respect of them, they are barbarisms. Nor is it, I think, denied, by any judicious person, that there are some idiomatical expressions in the New Testament which must have puzzled those who were absolute strangers to the language of Holy Writ²⁵. My intention, in observing this, is chiefly to show, that

²⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

²⁵ Take the two following for examples: *Ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα*, Luke, i. 37. and *ουκ αν εβωθη πασα σαρχ*, Matth. xxiv. 22. phrases which, in my apprehension, would not have been more intelligible to a Greek author than Arabic or Persian would have been. *Ρημα* for *thing*, *παν ουκ* and *πασα ουκ* for *no* or *none*, *σαρχ* for *person*, &c. would to him, I suspect, have proved insurmountable obstacles. Indeed the vulgar translation of the last phrase is no more Latin than the original is classical Greek. *Non feret salva omnis caro*, which we may venture to affirm would have been no better than a riddle to Cicero or Cæsar. Castalio has expressed the sense in proper Latin, *Nemo prorsus evaderet*. Our translators have not unfitly kept in their version the one Hebraism *flesh* for *person*, to which our ears are, by scriptural use, familiarized, and not less fitly rejected the

if we would enter thoroughly into the idiom of the New Testament, we must familiarize ourselves to that of the Septuagint; and if we would enter thoroughly into the idiom of the Septuagint, we must accustom ourselves to the study, not only of the original [of the Old Testament, but of the dialect spoken in Palestine, between the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; for this last, as well as the Hebrew, has affected the language both of the old Greek translation and of the New Testament. But of this more afterwards.

§ 15. SUCH is the origin and the character of the idiom which prevails in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, and the remarkable conformity of the new revelation which we have by them, though written in a different language, to the idiom of the old. It has been distinguished in the former by the name Hellenistic, not with critical accuracy, if regard be had to the derivation of the word, but with sufficient exactness, if attention be given to the application which the Hebrews made of the term Hellenist, whereby they distinguished their Jewish brethren who lived in Grecian cities, and spoke Greek. It has been, by some of late, after father Simon of the *Oratory*,

other saying, *No flesh should be saved*; for every body must be sensible that if they had preserved also the other idiom in English, and said, *All flesh should not be saved*, the sense would have been totally altered. This is but a small specimen, not the hundredth part of what might be produced, on this subject.

more properly termed the Greek of the synagogue. It is acknowledged that it cannot strictly be denominated a separate language, or even dialect, when the term dialect is conceived to imply peculiarities in declension and conjugation. But, with the greatest justice, it is denominated a peculiar idiom, being not only Hebrew and Chaldaic phrases put in Greek words, but even single Greek words used in senses in which they never occur in the writings of prophane authors, and which can be learnt only from the extent of signification given to some Hebrew or Chaldaic word, corresponding to the Greek, in its primitive and most ordinary sense. This difference in idiom constitutes a difficulty of another kind from that which is created by a difference in dialect; a difficulty much harder to be surmounted, as it does not affect the form of the words, but the meaning.

§ 16. It is pertinent, however, to observe that the above remarks on the Greek of the New Testament, do not imply that there was any thing which could be called idiomatical or vulgar in the language of our Lord himself, who taught always in his mother tongue. His apostles and Evangelists, on the contrary, who wrote in Greek, were, in writing, obliged to translate the instructions received from him into a foreign language of a very different structure, and for the use of people accustomed to a peculiar idiom. The apparently respectful manner in which our Saviour was accosted by all ranks of his countrymen, and in which they spoke of his teaching, shows

that he was universally considered as a person of eminent knowledge and abilities. It was the amazing success of his discourses to the people, in commanding the attention and reverence of all who heard him, which first awaked the jealousy of the scribes and pharisees.

PART II.

THE STYLE AND INSPIRATION.

WE are not, however, to imagine that, because all the writers of the New Testament wrote in the idiom of the synagogue, there is no discernible diversity in their styles. As the same language admits a variety of dialects, and even of provincial and foreign idioms, so the same dialect and the same idiom is susceptible of a variety of styles. The style of Paul has something peculiar, by which, in my opinion, there would be no difficulty in distinguishing him from any other writer. A discerning reader would not readily confound the style of Luke with that of either of the evangelists who preceded him, Matthew or Mark; and still less I imagine would he mistake the Apostle John's diction for that of any other penman of the New Testament. The same differences of style will be discovered by one who is but moderately conversant in Hebrew, in the writers of the Old Testament. In it we have still greater variety

than in the New. Some of the books are written in prose, and some in verse: and in each, the differences between one book and another are considerable. In the book of Job, for instance, the character of the style is remarkably peculiar. What can be more dissimilar in this respect, though both are excellent in their kind, than the towering flights of the sublime Isaiah, and the plaintive strains of the pathetic Jeremiah? In the books of Scripture, we can specify the concise style and the copious, the elevated and the simple, the aphoristic and the diffuse.

The difference, I own, is not so remarkable in translations as in the original. The reason will be evident on a little reflection. Every man, and consequently every translator has his peculiar diction and manner, which will rarely fail to affect, not only his own compositions, but also the versions he makes from other authors. In every version of the Bible, therefore, wherein the different books have the same translator, there will be more or less of an assimilating quality, by which the works translated are brought, in point of expression, to bear some resemblance to the ordinary style of the translator. Now, by being all brought nearer the same thing, they are brought nearer one another. Translation, therefore, is a sort of leveller. By its means, generally, not always (for some can adapt themselves to different styles more easily than others), the lofty is depressed, the humble elevated, the looser strains are confined, and the laconic rendered more explicit. The learned reader will be sensible of the justness of

this remark, when he reflects how much more distinguishable the styles of the sacred penmen above mentioned are in their own language, than even in the best translations extant. Add to this, that if, of any two sacred authors who differ greatly in their style, we compare together some passages, as they are rendered in the same translation, we shall commonly find the sameness of the translator's style more remarkable in them all, than the differences there may be of the styles of the authors. We shall be oftener at a loss to discover, in the quotations, (if the recollection of the sentiments do not assist us) Isaiah and Amos, Matthew and John, than to recognize Castalio and Beza, the Vulgate and Junius. Every translator, however, is not equally chargeable with this fault. I think none indeed so much as Castalio.

§ 2. BUT it may be asked, How is this diversity in the diction of the sacred penmen reconcilable with the idea of inspiration? Is not the style of all inspired writers the same, as being the style of the same Spirit by which they were alike directed? That in some sense the style of all those writers is the style of the Holy Spirit who spoke by them, and was the same in them all, is not to be denied; but that the Holy Spirit should always employ the same style in conveying celestial truths to men, is no more necessary than that he should always use the same language. People do not sufficiently advert, when they speak on this subject, to the difference between the expression and the sentiment, but strangely confound

these, as though they were the same ; yet no two things can be more widely different. The truths implied in the sentiments, are essential, immutable, and have an intrinsic value : the words which compose the expression, are in their nature circumstantial, changeable, and have no other value than what they derive from the arbitrary conventions of men. That the Holy Spirit would guide the minds of the sacred penmen in such a manner as to prevent their adopting terms unsuitable to his design, or which might obstruct his purpose ; and that, in other respects, he would accommodate himself to their manner and diction, is both reasonable in itself, and rendered unquestionable, by the works themselves, which have the like characteristic differences of style that we find in other literary productions.

Can it be accounted more strange that the Holy Spirit should, by the prophet Amos, address us in the style of a shepherd, and by Daniel, in that of a courtier, than that by the one, he should speak to us in Hebrew, and by the other, in Chaldee ? It is as reasonable to think that the Spirit of God would accommodate himself to the phraseology and diction, as to the tone of voice and pronunciation, of those whom he was pleased to enlighten ; for it cannot be denied that the pronunciation of one person, in uttering a prophecy, might be more articulate, more audible, and more affecting than that of another—in like manner as one style has more harmony, elegance, and perspicuity, than another. Castalio says justly, “ *Res dictat Spiritus, verba quidem et linguam*

“*loquenti aut scribenti liberam permittit*²⁶,” which is to the same purpose with what Jerom had said more than a thousand years before—“*Nec putemus in verbis scripturarum evangelium esse, sed in sensu*²⁷.” Allow me to add the testimony of a late writer of our own—than whom none has done more to make men apprehend the meaning, and relish the beauties of the sacred poesy : “*Hoc ita sacris vaticibus tribuimus, ut nihil derogemus Divini Spiritus afflatui : etsi suam interea vim propriæ cujusque scriptoris naturæ atque ingenio concedamus. Neque enim instinctu divino ita concitatur vatis animus, ut protinus obruatur hominis indoles : attolluntur et eriguntur, non extinguuntur aut occultantur naturalis ingenii facultates ; et quanquam Mosis, Davidis, et Isaia, scripta semper spirent quiddam tam excelsum tanque cæleste, ut plane videantur divinities edita, nihilo tamen minus in iis Mosem, Davidem, et Isaiam, semper agnoscimus*²⁸.”

§ 3. IN this there was an eminent disparity between the prophets of God and those among the Pagans, said to be possessed of the spirit of *Python*,

²⁶ “The Spirit dictates the things, leaving the words and language free to the speaker or the writer.” *Defensio contra Bezam.*

²⁷ “Let us not imagine that the gospel consists in the words of Scripture, but in the sense.” *Comment. in Epist. ad Gal. cap. 1.*

²⁸ *De Sacra Poësi Heb. Præl. xvi.*

or spirit of divination. These are reported to have uttered their predictions in what is called extasy or trance, that is, whilst they underwent a temporary suspension both of their reason and of their senses. Accordingly they are represented as mere machines, not acting but acted upon, and passive like the flute into which the musician blows. This is what has been called organic inspiration. In imitation of one remarkable class of these, the sorcerers and soothsayers among the Jews (who, like those of the same craft among Pagans, reaped considerable profit from abusing the credulity of the rabble), had acquired a wonderful mode of speaking, in which they did not appear to employ the common organs of speech, and were thence termed *εγγασκουμβοι*, *ventriloqui*, belly-speakers. It is in allusion to this practice that Isaiah denominates them *the wizards*²⁹ that peep and that mutter, whose speech seemed to rise out of the ground, and to whisper out of the dust³⁰.

Totally different was the method of the prophets of the true God. The matter, or all that concerned the thoughts, was given them: what concerned the manner, or enunciation, was left to themselves. The only exception the Rabbies mention is Balaam, whose prophecy appeared to them to have been emitted in spite of himself. But this case, if it was as they imagine, which may be justly doubted, was extraordinary. In all other cases, the prophets had, when prophesying, the same command over their own actions, over

²⁹ Isaiah, viii. 19.

³⁰ Isaiah, xxix. 4.

their members and organs, as at other times. They might speak, or forbear; they might begin, and desist, when they pleased; they might decline the task assigned them, and disobey the divine command. No doubt when they acted thus, they sinned very heinously, and were exposed to the wrath of Heaven. Of the danger of such disobedience we have two signal examples, in the prophet who was sent to prophesy against the altar erected by Jeroboam at Bethel, and in the prophet Jonah.

But that men continued still free agents, and had it in their power to make a very injudicious use of the spiritual gifts and illuminations which they had received from above, is manifest from the regulations, on this subject, established by the Apostle Paul, in the church of Corinth. The words wherewith he concludes his directions on this topic are very apposite to my present purpose. *The spirits of the prophets*, says he³¹, *are subject to the prophets*. Such is the difference between those who are guided by the Spirit of Truth, and those who are under the influence of a Spirit of error. There is therefore no reason to doubt that the sacred writers were permitted to employ the style and idiom most familiar to them, in delivering the truths with which they were inspired. So far only they were over-ruled, in point of expression, by the divine Spirit, that nothing could be introduced tending, in any way, to obstruct the intention of the whole. And sometimes, especially

³¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 32.

in the prediction of future events, such terms would be suggested, as would, even beyond the prophet's apprehension, conduce to further that end. The great object of divine regard, and subject of revelation, is things, not words. And were it possible to obtain a translation of scripture absolutely faultless, the translation would be, in all respects, as valuable as the original.

§ 4. BUT is not this doctrine, it may be said, liable to an objection also from the gift of tongues conferred on the Apostles and others, for the promulgation of the gospel? In the languages with which those primitive ministers were miraculously furnished, it may be objected, they could not have any style of their own, as a style is purely the effect of habit, and of insensible imitation. This objection, however, is easily obviated: First, as they received by inspiration those tongues only, whereof they had previously no knowledge, it is not probable, at least it is not certain, that this gift had any place in the writings of the New Testament: that in most of them it had not, is manifest. But, 2dly, if in some it had, the most natural supposition is, first, that the knowledge of the tongue, wherewith the Holy Ghost inspired the sacred writers, must have been, in them, precisely such a knowledge and such a readiness in finding words and expressions, as is, in others, the effect of daily practice. This is even a necessary consequence of supposing that the language itself, and not the words of particular speeches (according to Dr.

Middleton's notion³²), was the gift of the Spirit : 2dly, That their acquaintance with the tongue, supernaturally communicated, must have been such as would render their teaching in it best adapted to the apprehensions of the people with whom they would be most conversant, or such as they would have most readily acquired among them in the natural way. Now on this hypothesis, which appears on many accounts the most rational, the influence of habit, of native idiom, and of particular genius and turn of thinking, would be the same on the writer's style as though he had acquired the language in the ordinary way.

As to the hypothesis of the author above mentioned, it is not more irrational in itself, than it is destitute of evidence. It is irrational, as it excludes the primary use, the conversion of the nations, for which, by the general acknowledgment of Christians in all ages, the gift of tongues was bestowed on the Apostles, and represents this extraordinary power, as serving merely to astonish the hearers, the only purpose, according to him, for which it ever was exerted. And as to evidence, the great support of his system is an argument which has been sufficiently considered already, the defects of the style of the sacred writers, when examined by the rules of the rhetoricians, and the example of the orators of Athens. For, because Cicero and the Greek philosophers were of opinion, that if Jupiter spoke Greek, he would speak like Plato, the learned doctor cannot con-

³² Essay on the Gift of Tongues.

ceive that a style so unlike Plato's as that of the Evangelists, can be the language of inspiration, or be accounted worthy of God. It was not, we find, peculiar to the Greeks, or to the apostolic age, to set too high a value on the words which man's wisdom teacheth. Nor was it only in the days of Samuel, that men needed to be taught that *the Lord seeth not as man seeth*³³.

³³ 1 Sam. xvi. 7.

Dissertation the Second.

The Causes to which the principal Differences in Languages are imputable ; the Origin of the Changes produced on the Language and the Idiom of the Jews, and the principal Difficulties to be encountered in translating the Sacred Books.

PART I.

THE CAUSES OF THE DIFFERENCES IN LANGUAGES.

WHEN we compare one tongue with another, if we enter critically into the genius and powers of each, we shall find, that neither the only nor the chief difference is that which is most obvious, and consists in the sounds or words employed, the inflexions, the arrangement, and the construction. These may soon be learnt from a tolerable grammar, and are to be considered as affecting only the form of the language. There are others, which more intimately affecting its spirit, it requires a nicer discernment to distinguish. These serve much more to characterise, both the language, and the people who speak it. Indeed, the knowledge of one of these has a great effect in advancing the knowledge of the other. We may say, with the greatest justice, that as, on the one

hand, the real character of a nation will not be thoroughly understood by one who is a perfect stranger to their tongue; so, on the other, the exact import of many of the words and combinations of words, made use of in the language, will never be perfectly comprehended by one who knows nothing of the character of the people, who is totally unacquainted with the history of their religion, law, polity, arts, manners, and customs. Whoever, therefore, would be a proficient in either kind, must be a student in both. It is evident, that the particulars enumerated, or whatever regards the religion, the laws, the constitution, and the manners of a people, operate powerfully on their sentiments; and these have a principal effect, first on the associations of ideas formed in their minds, in relation to character and to whatever is an object of abstract reflection; secondly, on the formation of words, and combination of phrases, by which these associations are expressed. But this will be better understood from what follows.

§ 2. THERE are certain words, in every language, to which there are other words perfectly corresponding, in other languages. There are certain words, in every language, which but imperfectly correspond to any of the words of other languages. There are certain words, in every language, to which there is nothing, in some other languages, in any degree, correspondent. I shall exemplify these three classes in Greek,

Latin, and English, which will sufficiently illustrate my meaning.

§ 3. IN all languages, the words whereby the obvious productions of nature, and the plainest distinctions of genera and species known to the people are signified, correspond respectively to one another. Thus to the Greek words *ηλιος*, *σεληνη*, *ορνις*, *δενδρον*, *αετος*, *αμπελος*, *λιθος*, the Latin words, *sol*, *luna*, *avis*, *arbor*, *aquila*, *vitis*, *lapis*, and the English, *sun*, *moon*, *bird*, *tree*, *eagle*, *vine*, *stone*, are perfectly equivalent in signification; and we are sure that we can never mistake in rendering the Greek word *ηλιος*, wherever it occurs, into Latin, by the word *sol*, and into English, by the word *sun*. The same thing holds true of the other terms in the three languages, taken severally, in the order in which I have placed them.

To this class we must add the names of natural and obvious relations, as *πατηρ*, *μητηρ*, *υιος*, *θυγατηρ*, *αδελφος*, *αδελφη*, to which the Latin words *pater*, *mater*, *filius*, *filia*, *frater*, *soror*, and the English words *father*, *mother*, *son*, *daughter*, *brother*, *sister*, perfectly correspond.

To the same class we ought also to assign those words whereby the most common and necessary productions of the mechanic arts are expressed: for though, in different countries, and distant ages, there are considerable differences in the fashion and appearance of their productions; we attend solely, in translating, to the principal

uses which a piece of work was intended to answer. Consequently, when in these we find an entire coincidence, we, without further examination, pronounce the names equivalent. Thus *οικος*, *ναυς*, *κλινη*, in Greek, and *domus*, *navis*, *lectus*, in Latin, answer sufficiently to *house*, *ship*, *bed*, in English, on account of the coincidence in use of the things signified, notwithstanding the less important differences in structure and workmanship.

These, however, are not entirely on the same footing with natural objects, in which there is everywhere, and in every age, a more perfect uniformity. The names *βιβλιον*, *liber*, *book*, are in most cases suited to one another. But as the books of the ancients were in outward form and construction very different from ours; when we find any thing advanced concerning *βιβλιον* in Greek, or *liber* in Latin, with an evident allusion to the outward make, we know that the English word *book* is not a proper version. Thus the words *σρανος απεχωρισθη ως βιβλιον ειλισσομενον*³⁴, if rendered, "heaven departed as a book that is rolled "up," would not be intelligible, though nothing conveys a more distinct image than the words in the original. Their books consisted of long scrolls, commonly of parchment, sewed or pasted together, and fastened at the ends to two rollers. Our translators properly therefore employed here the more general word *scroll*, which perfectly conveys the meaning. Again, the word *βιβλιον* occurs

³⁴ Rev. vi. 14.

in an application wherein the term *book* could not be rightly apprehended by a mere English reader: *Βιβλιον γεγραμμενον εσωθεν και οπισθεν*³⁵, in the common version, *a book written within and on the back-side*. To such a reader, the last term thus applied would be understood to mean the cover, which is not very fit for being written on, and could, besides, contain no more than might have been contained in one additional leaf, though the book had consisted of a thousand leaves. Now the long scrolls or books of the ancients were seldom written but on one side, here said to be *εσωθεν*, *within*, because that side was turned inwards in rolling. When any of these scrolls was written on both sides, it contained twice as much as if written in the usual way³⁶. The chief intention of the Prophet in mentioning this circumstance, must have been to signify that this volume was replete with information, and that its contents were not to be measured by its size. But notwithstanding the exceptions in a few particular cases, the names of the common productions of the most necessary arts, may be considered as so far at least corresponding to each other in most languages, as not to throw any difficulty worth mentioning in the way of a translator.

³⁵ Rev. v. 1.

³⁶ A book executed in this manner the Greeks called *οπισθογραφος*, which is thus expressed by Juvenal, "*Scriptus et in tergo.*" Sat. 1.

§ 4. THE second class above mentioned, is of those words which, in one language, do, but imperfectly, correspond to any of the words of another language compared with it. Of this kind will be found, if properly attended to, most of the terms relating to morals, to the passions and matters of sentiment, or to the objects of the reflex and internal senses, in regard to which, it is often impossible to find words in one language, that are exactly equivalent to those of another. This holds in all languages, less or more, according as there is more or less, uniformity, in the constitution, religion, and laws, of the nations whose languages are compared; on which constitution, religion, and laws, as was observed, the sentiments, manners, and customs of the people, in a great measure, depend. Herein consists one principal difficulty which translators, if persons of penetration, have to encounter. Finding it sometimes impossible to render fully the sense of their author, they are constrained (if I may borrow a term from the mathematicians) to do the best they can by approximation.

To come to examples: To the Greek words *αρετη*, *σωφροσυνη*, *εγκρατεια*, *φρονησις*, *ελεος*, the Latin words, *virtus*, *temperantia*, *continentia*, *prudentia*, *miseriordia*, are not entirely equivalent; still less the English words *virtue*, *temperance*, *continence*, *prudence*, *mercy*: for, though these last are manifestly formed from the Latin words, one would think that, by being adopted into another country, they had all, more or less, changed their

nature with the climate. Those persons whose knowledge, in such matters, is but superficial, will not enter readily into these sentiments. They are accustomed to consider certain words, in the different languages, as respectively correspondent. The grammars, lexicons, and common translations, lead them to conclude so, and they inquire no further. But those who are conversant with authors of reputation, in these different tongues, will need no arguments to convince them of the truth of what has been advanced.

Who knows not that the Latin word *virtus* would, in many instances, be but weakly, not to say improperly, rendered by the English word *virtue*; as that word, in Roman authors, comes often nearer the import of what we call *valour* or *fortitude*, sometimes even *brute force*? We should not readily ascribe *virtue* to wild beasts; yet Tacitus so applies the term *virtus*: “*Fera animalia, si clausa teneas, virtutis obliviscuntur.*” And if some of our words have too great latitude of signification to answer always to their Latin etymons; some have, on the contrary, too little. For example, the English word *temperance* is too confined in meaning to answer to the Latin *temperantia*, which implies moderation in every desire, and is defined by Cicero, in one place, “*moderatio cupiditatum rationi obediens*³⁷ ;” and in another, “*temperantia est quæ in rebus aut expetendis aut fugiendis, rationem ut sequamur, monet*³⁸.” Now all that is implied in the English word is almost

³⁷ De Fin, l. ii.

³⁸ De Fin. l. i.

only that species which he denominates "*temperantia in victu.*" And, though the differences may not be so considerable in all the other related words above mentioned, it were easy to shew that they cannot, in every instance, be made to tally.

It requires, indeed, but a very small skill in languages to enable us to discover that etymology is often a very unsafe guide to the proper acceptance of a term. It will not be doubted that the Latin word *sobrius* is the root of the English word *sober*, and the term *honestum* of our term *honesty*; but every body knows that the related words, in the two languages, will not always answer to each other. Nay, to shew, in the strongest manner, how much more difficult it is, than is commonly imagined, to apprehend the precise import, and proper application, of words of this order in dead languages, I shall transcribe a short passage from the fourth book of the Tusculan Questions, where the author explains the generic word *ægritudo*, with the various names of species comprehended under it. Amongst other observations are the following: "*Ægritudo est opinio recens mali presentis, in quo demitti contrahique animo rectum esse videatur. Ægritudini subjiciuntur angor, mæror, dolor, luctus, ærumna, afflictatio: angor est ægritudo premens, mæror ægritudo flebilis, ærumna ægritudo laboriosa, dolor ægritudo crucians, afflictatio ægritudo cum vexatione corporis, luctus ægritudo ex ejus, qui carus fuerat, interitu acerbo.*" "Let any one," says D'Alembert³⁹,

³⁹ Sur l'Harmonie des Langues, et sur la Latinité des Modernes.

“ examine this passage with attention, and say
“ honestly, whether, if he had not known of it, he
“ would have had any idea of these nice shades of
“ signification here marked ; and whether he would
“ not have been much embarrassed, had he been
“ writing a dictionary, to distinguish with accuracy
“ the words *ægritudo, mæror, dolor, angor, luctus,*
“ *ærumna, afflictatio.* If Cicero, the greatest phi-
“ losopher as well as orator that ever Rome pro-
“ duced, had composed a book of Latin synonymas,
“ such as that which Abbe Girard did of French ;
“ and if this work had but now for the first time
“ been produced in a circle of modern Latinists, I
“ imagine it would have greatly confounded them,
“ in showing them how defective their knowledge
“ is of a subject of which they thought themselves
“ masters.”

I have brought this quotation, not to support D’Alembert’s opinion, who maintains that it is impossible for any modern to write Latin with purity ; but only to shew how much nicer a matter it is than is commonly supposed, to enter critically into the peculiarities of a dead language. It might be easily shown, were it necessary, that distinctions like those now illustrated in the nouns, obtain also in the verbs of different languages. Under this class those words also may be comprehended which are not barely the names of certain things, or signs of particular ideas, but which express also the affection or disposition of the speaker, towards the thing signified. In every language, we shall find instances wherein the same thing has different names, which are not perfectly sy-

nonymous ; for though there be an identity of subject, there is a difference of manner, wherein the speaker appears affected towards it. One term will convey the idea with contempt, another with abhorrence, a third with some relish, a fourth with affection, and a fifth with indifference. Of this kind are the diminutives and amplificatives which abound so much in the Greek, and Italian, languages.

It is this principally which justifies Girard's observation, that there are much fewer words in any language which are, in all respects, synonymous than is commonly imagined. And it is this which makes the selection of apposite words so much, and so justly, the study of an orator : for when he would operate on the passions of his hearers, it is of the last consequence, that the terms he employs not only convey the idea of the thing signified, which may be called the primary use ; but that, along with it, they insinuate into the minds of the hearers, the passion of the speaker, whatever it be, love, or hatred, admiration or contempt, aversion or desire. This, though the secondary use of the word, is not the less essential to his design. It is chiefly from the associated affection that these different qualities of synonymous words taken notice of by Quintilian must be considered as originating : "*Sed cum idem frequentissime plura significent, quod συνωνυμα vocatur, jam sunt alia aliis honestiora, sublimiora, nitidiora, jucundiora, vocaliora.*" The last is the only epithet which regards merely the sound. The following will serve for an example of such English synonymas,

public speaker, orator, declaimer, haranguer, holder-forth. The subject of them all is the same, being what the first expression, *public speaker*, simply denotes; the second expresses also admiration in the person who uses it; the third conveys disapprobation, by hinting that it is the speaker's object rather to excite the passions, than to convince the judgment; the fourth is disrespectful, and the fifth contemptuous.

But there is a difference in words called synonymous, arising from the customary application, even when they imply little or nothing of either sentiment or affection. The three words, *death, decease, demise*, all denote the same thing. The first is the simple and familiar term; the second is formal, being much employed in proceedings at law; the third is ceremonious, and scarcely used of any but princes and grandees. There are also some words peculiar to poetry, some to burlesque, which it is needless here to specify. From these observations we learn that, in writings where words of this second class frequently occur, it is impossible, in a consistency with either perspicuity, or propriety, to translate them uniformly, by the same terms, like those of the first. For, as has been observed, they are such as do not perfectly correspond with the terms of a different tongue. You may find a word that answers exactly to the word in question in one acceptance, that will not suit it in another; though for this purpose some other term may be found equally well adapted.

It was too servile an attempt in the first translators of the Old Testament (at least of the Penta-

teuch, for the whole does not appear to have been translated at one time, or by the same persons), at this rigid uniformity in rendering the same Hebrew words by the same Greek words, which has given such a peculiarity of idiom to the style of the Septuagint, and which, issuing thence as from its fountain, has infected, more or less, all the writings of the New Testament. I might observe further, that there are some words, in the original, by no means synonymous, which have been, almost uniformly, rendered by the same term, partly, perhaps, through not adverting sufficiently to some of the nicer differences of signification, partly through a desire of avoiding, as much as possible, in the translation, whatever might look like comment or paraphrase. Of this I shall have occasion to take notice afterwards.

§ 5. THE third class above mentioned is of those words, in the language of every nation, which are not capable of being translated into that of any people, who have not a perfect conformity with them in those customs which have given rise to those words. Such are the names of weights, measures, and coins, which are, for the most part, different in different countries. There is no way that a translator can properly take in such cases, but to retain the original term, and give the explanation in the margin. This is the way which has actually been taken, perhaps in all the translations of the Old Testament. To substitute for the original term a definition or circumlocution, if the word frequently occur, would encumber the

style with an offensive multiplicity of words, and awkward repetitions, and thereby destroy at once its simplicity, vivacity, and even perspicuity. In this class we must also rank the names of the particular rites, garments, modes, exercises, or diversions, to which there is nothing similar among those into whose language the version is to be made. Of this class there are several words retained in the common English translation; some of which, by reason of their frequency have been long since naturalized amongst us; as *synagogue*, *sabbath*, *jubilee*, *purim*, *ephod*, *homer*, *ephah*, *shekel*, *gerah*, *teraphim*, *urim* and *thummim*, *phylacteries*, *cherubim*, *seraphim*, and a few others.

Beside these, often the names of offices, judicatories, sects, parties, and the like, scarcely admit of being transferred into a version in any other manner. It must be owned, however, that in regard to some of these, especially offices, it is a matter of greater nicety than is commonly imagined, to determine when the name ought to be rendered in the translation by a term imperfectly corresponding, and when it ought to be retained. What makes the chief difficulty here is, that there are offices, in every state, and in every constitution, which are analogous to those of other states and constitutions, in many material circumstances, though they differ in many others. It is not always easy to say, whether the resemblances or the peculiarities preponderate. If the former, the word ought to be translated, if the latter, it ought to be retained. The inconveniency of an

excess in the first way is, that it may lead the reader into mistakes ; that of an excess in the second is, that it occasions obscurity, and by the too frèquent interspersion of uncouth and foreign words, gives the appearance of barbarism to a version.

It may be said, however, in general, that the latter is the safer error of the two. Not only does the speciality of the case afford a sufficient apology for the use of such words ; but if either the dignity of the nation, which is the subject, or our connexion with the people, or interest in their history, shall familiarize us to their institutions and customs, the barbarism of the terms will vanish of course. Who considers now these names of Roman magistracies, *consul, pretor, edile, censor, questor, dictator, tribune*, as barbarous ? Yet they are not the names of offices amongst us correspondent, or similar, to those among the Romans. To have employed, instead of them, *mayor, alderman, sheriff, &c.* we should have justly thought much more exceptionable. I have heard of a Dutch translator of Cesar's Commentaries, who always rendered *consul, burgomaster*, and in the same taste, the name of all the other officers and magistrates of Rome. A version of this kind would appear to us ridiculous.

§ 6. IT is almost unnecessary to observe, that the two last are the only classes of words wherein the student will find any thing that can greatly puzzle him. A mere schoolboy, with the help of his grammar and lexicon, may acquire all that is

requisite for the just interpretation of the words of the first class. Those of the third, it is manifest, are not to be understood by us without a previous knowledge of the religious and political constitutions of the country, together with their ceremonies and usages; and those of the second, which is the matter of the greatest delicacy of all, cannot be thoroughly apprehended without an acquaintance with the national character, that is, the prevalent cast of mind, manners, and sentiments of the people. So much is necessary in order to be master of the language of any country; and of so much importance it is, in order clearly to comprehend the style of Scripture, to be well acquainted with whatever concerns the Jewish nation.

PART II.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHANGES IN THE IDIOM OF THE JEWS.

IT is true that, as the New Testament is written in Greek, it must be of consequence that we be able to enter critically into the ordinary import of the words of that tongue, by being familiarized to the genius and character of those who spoke it. But from what has been observed it is evident that though, in several cases, this knowledge may be eminently useful, it will not suffice; nay, in many cases it will be of little or no significance. Those words, in particular, which have

been in most familiar use with the old interpreters, and have been current in the explanations given in the Hellenistical synagogues and schools, have, with their naturalization among the Israelites, acquired in the Jewish use, if I may be allowed the expression, an infusion of the national spirit. Though the words therefore are Greek, Jewish erudition is of more service than Grecian, for bringing us to the true acceptation of them in the sacred writings. Would you know the full import of the words *ἁγιασμος*, for example, and *δικαιοσύνη* in the New Testament? It will be in vain to rummage the classics. Turn to the pages of the Old Testament. It will avail little to recur to the Greek roots *ἅγιος* and *δικη*. Examine the extent given to the signification of the Hebrew roots *קדש kadash*, and *צדק tsadak*, which have given occasion to the introduction of those Greek terms into the translation of the Seventy.

§ 2. CLASSICAL use, both in Greek, and in Latin, is not only, in this study, sometimes unavailable, but may even mislead. The sacred use, and the classical, are often very different. We know the import of the word *sanctitas* in the Vulgate and in ecclesiastical writers, and that it answers exactly enough to our own word *sanctity* derived from it. Yet from Cicero's account, it is plain that, in modern European tongues, we have no word corresponding to it in its primitive and classical use. "ÆQUITAS," says he, "tri-partita dicitur esse. Una ad superos deos,

“ altera ad manes, [tertia ad homines pertinere ;
 “ prima *pietas*, secunda *sanctitas*, tertia *justitia* no-
 “ minatur⁴⁰.” According to him, therefore, the
 Latin word *sanctitas* imports equity or suitable
 regards towards the infernal gods.

But, in no instance, does the classical sense of a
 word differ more from that which it has invariably
 in the sacred pages, than in the term *ταπεινος*,
 which, with the former, is always expressive of a
 bad quality, with the latter, of a good. With us,
 it is a virtue, with them, it was a vice. Nor can
 it be justly affirmed that the word expressed
 the same disposition of mind, with Pagans, as with
 Jews and Christians, and that the only difference
 was, in the opinion or judgment formed con-
 cerning this disposition ; that the former looked
 upon it with a favourable eye, the latter with an
 unfavourable. For this is far from being the
 case. The quality of which it is expressive, in
 classical use, is totally different from that which
 it expresses, in the sacred writings. In the first
 it corresponded exactly to, and was commonly
 translated by, the Latin *humilis*, which in profane
 authors, always conveys a bad meaning, and de-
 notes such a feeble, mean, and abject temper,
 as is the very reverse of that fortitude, that su-
 periority to death, shame, and pain, which the
 law of Christ so peremptorily exacts, and with
 which the faith of Christ so powerfully inspires
 the genuine disciple. *Ταπεινοτης*, the abstract,
 is comprised by Aristotle⁴¹ under *μικροψυχια*,

⁴⁰ Topica.

⁴¹ Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ κακιῶν.

pusillanimity; or, as explained by lexicographers, “*animus demissus et abjectus*,” and contrasted to μεγαλοψυχια, magnanimity, “*animi celsitudo*.” And to evince that the Latin term, in heathen authors, has the same meaning with the Greek, I need no better authority than Cicero, who says⁴², “*Succumbere doloribus, eosque humili animo inbecilloque ferre miserum est, ob eamque debilitatem animi, multi parentes, multi amicos, nonnulli patriam, plerique autem seipsos penitus perdididerunt.*” To this he opposes, “*Robustus animus et excelsus, qui omni est liber cura et angore, cum et mortem contemnit,*” &c. The temper of mind here condemned by Cicero, every Christian will condemn as much as he; and the application of the term *humilis* to this temper, is a demonstration, that, with him, the word was the sign of an idea very different from that, of which it has since, in conformity to the style of the Italic translation, been made the sign, by ecclesiastical authors.

We may observe, by the way, that the English word *humility*, though borrowed directly from the Latin, conveys not the classical, but the scriptural sense of the word ταπεινοτης or ταπεινοφροσυνη, which Castalio, over-zealous for the Latinity of his style, never renders *humilitas*, but always *modestia*. This word *modestia*, however, does not express adequately the sense of the original. *Modesty* relates only to the opinion of men, *humility* relates also, and principally, to the unerr-

⁴² De Finibus, l. i.

ing judgment of God; and includes such a combination of qualities as no species of polytheism could give a foundation for. It implies, along with a modest self-diffidence, a sense of unworthiness in the sight of God, accompanied with a profound veneration of his perfections. Accordingly piety, meekness, and modesty, make, if I may so express myself, the principal figures in the groupe. So far from involving any thing of that weak timidity and irresolution expressed in the passage quoted from the philosopher, as comprehended in the classical sense of the term *humilis*; it, on the contrary, implies, in every situation, a submission to the will of Heaven, without repining or reserve, founded in a consciousness of one's own ignorance of what is best, upon the whole, and an unshaken confidence in the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, by whose providence all events are over-ruled.

This is one of those terms which, in the mouth of a Jew or a Christian, an idolater could not comprehend, till he had previously acquired some notion of the Biblical theology. To some people it may appear strange, that so much knowledge should be thought necessary for qualifying one to understand the words in current use in any language. But to those more deeply versed in these matters there will be nothing surprising in the remark. They will be sensible that the modern names, *pedantry*, *gallantry*, *foppery*, *coquetry*, *prudery*, and many others, could not be translated into any ancient language, otherwise

than by circumlocutions. Montesquieu⁴³ observes of what is called *honour* in the monarchies of Europe, that it is unknown, and consequently unnamed in the despotisms of Asia, and that it would even be a matter of some difficulty to render the term, as understood by Europeans, intelligible to a Persian.

§ 3. I SHOULD not have been so particular on the different acceptations of some words, as used by Jews and by Pagans, but in order to illustrate more effectually that important proposition, that Scripture will ever be found its own best interpreter; and to evince, what was remarked before, that the manners and sentiments of a people, being closely connected with their constitution and customs, sacred and civil, have a powerful influence on the language, especially on those combinations of ideas, which serve to denote the various *phases* (pardon the unusual application of the term) both of virtue and of vice, as displayed in the characters of individuals. For, though some traces of all the virtuous, and all the vicious, qualities of which human nature is susceptible, will perhaps be found in every country; these qualities are greatly diversified in their appearance, inasmuch as they invariably receive a kind of signature, or peculiar modification, from the national character. One plain consequence of this doctrine has been already considered, namely, that there will be a diversity in the associated

⁴³ L'Esprit des Loix, liv. iii. ch. 8. Lett. Pers. 88.

ideas classed under the appellatives, and consequently in the genius of the languages, wherever there is a diversity of character, in the nations which use them.

§ 4. I AM NOW going to exemplify another consequence of this doctrine, which is, that the language of the same people will vary from itself, or, to speak more properly, from what it was in a former period, when the people themselves undergo a material alteration from what they were, in any of the respects above mentioned. Indeed it is manifest that, if a nation should continue at the same precise degree of advancement in the sciences and arts, both elegant and useful, should undergo no variation, in their form of government, religion, and laws, and should have little or no intercourse with foreigners, their language and idiom would, in all essential characters, remain the same. These two, language and idiom, though often confounded, I have had occasion to discriminate before. The distinction deserves our attention the more, as some of the causes mentioned, operate more upon the one, and others more upon the other; and as one of them may be even totally altered, whilst the other is retained. This was accordingly the case with the Jewish nation.

§ 5. DURING the Babylonish captivity, the Jews scattered through the Assyrian provinces lost irrecoverably, in consequence of the mixture with

strangers so much superior to them in number and consideration, their vernacular dialect. But, in consequence of their attachment to their religion (which included their polity and law); in consequence of their inviolable regard to their own customs, and of their detestation, both of the customs, and of the arts, of the heathen; in consequence of their veneration for the sacred books, and their never hearing any other than a literal version of them in the public offices of religion, they still, in a great measure, preserved the idiom; insomuch that, if the Chaldee of Jerusalem was not as different from the Chaldee of Babylon as the Greek of the synagogue was from the Greek of the classics, the only assignable reason perhaps is, that the idiom of the Hebrew and that of the Chaldee were originally more akin to each other, than the idiom of the Greek was to either. Now the idiom keeps a much firmer hold of the mind, than the words, which are mere sounds, do, and which, compared with the other, may be considered as but the body, the material part of a language, whereof the idiom is the soul.

Though the Jewish tongue therefore became different, their idiom was nearly the same. I say nearly so; hence we infer, that the knowledge of the style and idiom of the Old Testament must throw light upon the New: but it was not entirely the same. Hence we conclude the utility of knowing the state of the rabbinical and traditionary learning of that people in the days

of our Saviour, this being the most effectual means of illustrating those particulars wherein the idiom of the New Testament differs from that of the Old. It was indeed impossible that such an intercourse with strangers as extirpated their language, should not be productive of some effect on their notions of things, sentiments, and manners. And changes produced in the sentiments and manners of a people, never fail to show themselves in their writings.

§ 6. BUT, if what happened during their captivity had some effect on these; what followed after their return to Judea had a much greater. The persecutions they endured under the Grecian empire, on account of their religion, did, as is often the case, greatly endear it to them, and make them consider it in a light, in which (whatever may be said of individuals) they seem never as a nation to have considered it in before. It became more an object and a study to them. Sensible how little their perseverance secured them the temporal advantages held forth in the letter of the law, they became fond of attending to those spiritual and sublime interpretations, both of the law, and of the prophets, which served to fortify the mind against all secular losses and misfortunes, and inspire it with hope, in the immediate views of torture, and of death. Besides, the intercourse which, from the time of the Macedonian conquests, they unavoidably had with the Greeks, introduced insensibly, into their manner of treating religion, an infusion of the

philosophic spirit, with which they had before been utterly unacquainted.

The Greeks were perhaps the most inquisitive, the most ingenious, and the most disputatious, people that ever appeared upon the earth. The uncommon importance which the Jews attributed to their religious peculiarities, both in doctrine, and in ceremonies, and their abhorrence of the ceremonies of other nations, with whom they would have no intercommunity in worship, could not fail to provoke the scrutiny and contradiction of a people at once so acute and so conceited as the Greeks. The Jews also, in self-defence, began to scrutinize and argue. On examining and comparing, they perceived, in a stronger light than ever, the inexpressible futility and absurdity of the mythology of the Greeks, and the noble simplicity, purity, and sublimity of their own theology. The spirit of inquiry begot among them, as might have been expected, the spirit of dogmatizing, a spirit quite unknown to their ancestors, though many centuries had elapsed from their establishment in Canaan, to the period of which I am speaking. One of the first consequences of the dogmatical spirit was a division into factions and sects.

In this state we find them, in the days of our Lord; the whole nation being split into Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. Now, of such party distinctions there is not a single vestige in the Old Testament. The dogmatists, on the different sides, would have recourse to different theories, the theories would give rise to particular phrases,

by which the peculiar opinions of the partizans would be expressed, and even to particular applications of the words and phrases to which they had been accustomed before. Hence the usefulness of understanding their differences, and tenets, and manner of expounding sacred writ.

§ 7. BUT, though the differences in opinions, and modes of exposition, which prevailed in the different sects, do not much affect the style of the historical part of the New Testament, which, in its nature, gives less occasion for introducing subtleties in speculation, and was written by men who, from their education, cannot be supposed to have entered much into the polemical discussions of those days; they may reasonably be supposed to affect the style of the epistolary writings, especially of Paul, who was an adept in all the Jewish learning of the age. Indeed we learn from Philo, Josephus, and the talmudical writers, that their literati, at that period, were become fond of assigning a moral significance and purpose to all the ritual observances of the law, and of applying the words and phrases relating to these, in a certain figurative and mystical manner. That, in their mode of application, they would often be whimsical, I do not deny; but that the New Testament itself gives ground to think that their ceremonies and carnal ordinances, as the Apostle calls them⁴⁴, were intended to adumbrate some spiritual and more important instructions, appears to me uncontrovertible.

⁴⁴ Heb. ix. 10.

But whatever be in this, it must be allowed to be a matter of some moment, that we form a right notion of the different dogmas and prevailing taste of the time. The reason is evident. The sacred writers, in addressing those of their own nation, would doubtless, in order to be understood, adapt themselves, as their great Master had done before them, to the prevailing idiom and phraseology. Now, this is to be learned only from the common usages, and from the reigning modes of thinking and reasoning, which distinguished the people in that age and nation.



PART III.

THE DIFFICULTIES FOUND IN TRANSLATING THE SCRIPTURES.

It can scarcely admit a doubt that, as every language has in it something peculiar, and as the people of every nation have customs, rites, and manners wherein they are singular; each tongue will have its special difficulties; which will always be the greater to strangers, the more remote the customs, rites, and manners of the nation are, from the customs, rites, and manners of other nations: for, in the same proportion, the genius of the tongue will differ from that of other tongues. If so, it is no wonder that the distinguishing particularity of the Jews in constitution, sentiments, ceremonies, and laws, should render it more difficult to

translate, with justness, from their language, than to translate from the language of any people who, in all the respects aforementioned, do not so remarkably differ from others.

It may be proper here to point out, more particularly, where difficulties of this kind will be found principally to lie. It is evident that they will not at all affect the construction of the sentences, or the inflections of the words. The analogy of the language, and its whole grammatical structure, may be very simple, and easily acquired, whatever be the customs of the people, or how extraordinary soever they may appear to us. Further, simple narration is not that kind of writing which will be much affected by those difficulties. The nouns which occur in it are generally of the first class, mentioned in the preceding part of this Dissertation. And in these, from the principles formerly explained, the interpreter will not often meet with any thing to retard his progress. If the narrative be of matters which concern the community at large, as in civil history, there will no doubt be frequent recourse to the words of the third class. But in regard to these, the method of adopting the original term, established by universal practice, and founded in necessity, whereby translators extricate themselves when correspondent terms cannot be found, does in effect remove the difficulty. And even when words of the second class occur, as will sometimes happen, there is a greater probability that the context will ascertain their meaning in an historical work, than there is where they occur in any other kind of writing, such as the didactic, the

declamatory, the proverbial, or aphoristic, and the argumentative.

This is the first difficulty proper to be mentioned, arising from difference of manners, a difficulty which cannot be said to affect the sacred writings peculiarly otherwise than in degree. It is always the harder to reach, in a version, the precise signification of the words of the original, the wider the distance is in sentiments and manners, between the nation in whose language the book is written, and the nation into whose language it is to be translated.

§ 2. THE second difficulty I shall take notice of, arises from the penury of words in the ancient oriental languages, at least in the Hebrew, a natural consequence of the simplicity of the people, the little proficiency made by them in sciences and arts, and their early withdrawing themselves, on account of religion, from the people of other nations. The fewer the words are, in any language, the more extensive commonly is the signification given to every word; and the more extensive the signification of a word is, there is the greater risk of its being misunderstood, in any particular application; besides, the fewness of words obliges writers of enlarged minds, for the sake of supplying the deficiency, frequently to recur to metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy, catachresis, and other rhetorical tropes. These, accordingly, are always found to abound most in the scantiest tongues. Now the frequent use of tropes

occasions an unavoidable obscurity, and sometimes ambiguity, in the expression.

§ 3. A THIRD difficulty arises from the penury of books extant in the genuine and ancient Hebrew, there being no more than the books of the Old Testament, and not even all these. When we consider the manner in which the knowledge of any language, even of our native tongue, is acquired, we find it is solely by attending to the several ways in which words are used in a vast variety of occurrences and applications, that the precise meaning is ascertained. As it is principally from conversation, in our mother-tongue, or in any living language which we learn from those who speak it, that we have occasion to observe this variety, so it is only in books that we have occasion to observe it, when employed in the acquisition of a dead language. Consequently, the fewer the books are, there is the greater risk of mistaking the sense, especially of those words which do not frequently occur. This has given rise to doubts about the meaning of some words, even of the first class, to wit, the names of a few natural objects, as plants, animals, and precious stones, which occur, but rarely, in Scripture, and, solely, in passages where sufficient light cannot be had from the context.

§ 4. It may indeed be said, that as the writers of the New Testament, employed not the Hebrew, but the Greek language, in their compositions; neither of the two remarks last mentioned can

affect them, however they may affect the penmen of the Old. The Greek is indeed a most copious language, and the books written in it are very numerous. But whoever would argue in this manner, must have forgotten, what has been fully evinced in the former Dissertation, that though the words, the inflection, and the construction in the books of the New Testament are Greek, the idiom is strictly Hebraical; or at least, he must not have reflected on the inevitable consequences of this doctrine; one of which is, that the Hebraistic Greek, or Greek of the synagogue, as it has been called, will, in a great measure, labour under the same inconveniences and defects with the tongue on which its idiom is formed. Another consequence is, that the scarcity of books in the language which is the parent of the idiom, is, in effect, a scarcity of the lights that are necessary, or at least convenient, for the easier discovery of the peculiarities of the idiomatic tongue formed upon it. The reason of both is obvious; it is from that language we must learn the import of the phrases, and even sometimes of particular words, which otherwise would often prove unintelligible.

§ 5. THE fourth difficulty which the interpreter of the Bible has to encounter, arises from the nature of the prophetic style, a style highly figurative, or, as some critics have thought proper to denominate it, symbolical. The symbolic or typical is, in my apprehension, very much akin to what may be called the allegoric style. There is, how-

ever, this difference: the symbols employed in prophecy have, like the Egyptian hieroglyphics, acquired a customary interpretation from the established use in that mode of writing, and are seldom or never varied; whereas the allegory is more at the discretion of the writer. One consequence of this is, that in the former there is not required the same exactness of resemblance between the symbols, or the types and their antitypes, as is required in allegory. The reason is obvious. The usual application supplies the defects in the first; whereas, in the second, it is solely by an accuracy of resemblance that an allegory can be distinguished from a riddle.

This difficulty however in the prophetic style, may be said, more strictly, to affect the expounder of the sacred oracles than the translator. For, in this mode of writing, there are two senses exhibited to the intelligent reader; first, the literal, and then the figurative: for, as the words are intended to be the vehicle of the literal sense, to the man who understands the language; so, the literal sense is intended to be the vehicle of the figurative, to the man whose understanding is exercised "to discern the things of the Spirit." It is to such, therefore, in a particular manner, that whatever is written in the symbolic style, in the New Testament, is addressed. Our Lord, to distinguish such from the unthinking multitude, calls them those who have ears to hear. *Whoso hath ears to hear, says he, let him hear*⁴². The same

⁴² Matth. xi. 15. xiii. 9. Mark, iv. 9. Luke, viii. 8.

expression is also used in the Apocalypse⁴⁵, a book of prophecies. And it deserves to be attended to, that Jesus Christ never employs these words in the introduction, or the conclusion, of any plain moral instructions, but always after some parable, or prophetic declarations figuratively expressed. Now, it is with the literal sense only, that the translator, as such, is concerned. For the literal sense ought invariably to be conveyed into the version, where, if you discover the antitype or mystical sense, it must be, though not through the same words, through the same emblems, as you do in the original.

This also holds in translating allegory, apologue, and parable. A man may render them exactly into another tongue, who has no apprehension of the figurative sense. Who can doubt that any fable of Esop or Phedrus, for example, may be translated, with as much justness, by one who has not been told, and does not so much as guess the moral, as by one who knows it perfectly? Whereas the principal concern of the expounder is to discover the figurative import. In the New Testament, indeed, there is only one book, the Apocalypse, written entirely in the prophetic style: and it must be allowed that that book may be accurately translated by one who has no apprehension of the spiritual meaning. However, in the greater part, both of the historical, and of the epistolary, writings, there are prophecies interspersed. Besides, some knowledge in the diction

⁴⁵ Rev. ii. 7. 11. 17. 29.

and manner of the prophets is necessary for the better apprehension of the application made in the New Testament, of the prophecies of the Old, and the reasonings of the Apostles in regard to those prophecies.—Indeed it may be affirmed in general, that for translating justly what is of a mixed character, where the emblematic is blended with the historical, some knowledge of the mystic applications is more essential, than for translating unmixed prophecy, allegory, or parable.

§ 6. I SHALL mention, as the cause of a fifth difficulty in the examination, and consequently in the right interpretation, of the Scriptures, that, before we begin to study them critically, we have been accustomed to read them in a translation, whence we have acquired a habit of considering many ancient and oriental terms, as perfectly equivalent to certain words in modern use in our own language, by which the other have been commonly rendered. And this habit, without a considerable share of knowledge, attention, and discernment, is almost never perfectly to be surmounted. What makes the difficulty still the greater is that, when we begin to become acquainted with other versions beside that into our mother-tongue, suppose Latin, French, Italian; these, in many instances, instead of correcting, serve but to confirm the effect. For, in these translations, we find the same words in the original, uniformly rendered by words which we know to correspond exactly, in the present use of those

tongues, to the terms employed in our own translation.

I hope I shall not be so far misunderstood by any, as to be supposed to insinuate, by this remark, that people ought to delay reading the Scriptures in a translation, till they be capable of consulting the original. This would be to debar the greater part of mankind from the use of them altogether, and to give up the many immense advantages derived from the instructions, contained in the very worst versions of that book, for the sake of avoiding a few mistakes, comparatively small, into which one may be drawn, even by the best. A child must not be hindered from using his legs in walking, on pretence that if he be allowed to walk, it will be impossible always to secure him from falling. My intention in remarking this difficulty, is to show first, that those early studies, however proper and even necessary in Christians, are nevertheless attended with this inconveniency, that at a time when we are incompetent judges, prepossessions are insensibly formed on mere habit or association, which afterwards, when the judgment is more mature, cannot easily be surmounted; 2dly, to account in part, without recurring to obscurity in the original, for the greater difficulty said to be found in explaining holy writ, than in expounding other works of equal antiquity; and, 3dly, to awake a proper circumspection and caution, in every one who would examine the Scriptures with that attention which the ineffable importance of the subject merits.

But, in order to set the observation itself in relation to this fifth difficulty in the strongest light, it would be necessary to trace the origin, and give, as it were, the history of some terms, which have become technical amongst ecclesiastical writers, pointing out the changes which in a course of ages they have insensibly undergone. When alterations are produced by slow degrees, they always escape the notice of the generality of people, and sometimes even of the more discerning. For a term once universally understood to be equivalent to an original term whose place it occupies in the translation, will naturally be supposed to be still equivalent, by those who do not sufficiently attend to the variations, in the meanings of words, which the tract of time, and the alterations in notions and customs thence arising, have imperceptibly introduced. Sometimes etymology too contributes to favour the deception. Is there one of a thousand, even among the readers of the original, who entertains the smallest suspicion that the words, *blasphemy, heresy, mystery, schism*, do not convey to moderns, precisely the same ideas which the Greek words *βλασφημία, αιρεσις, μυστηριον, σχισμα*, in the New Testament, conveyed to Christians, in the times of the Apostles? Yet that these Greek and English words are far from corresponding perfectly, I shall take an occasion of evincing afterwards⁴⁸. The same thing may be affirmed of several other words and even phrases which retain their currency on re-

⁴⁸ Dissertation ix.

ligious subjects, though very much altered in their signification.

§ 7. THE sixth and last difficulty, and perhaps the greatest of all, arises from this, that our opinions on religious subjects are commonly formed, not indeed before we read the Scriptures, but before we have examined them. The ordinary consequence is, that men afterwards do not search the sacred oracles in order to find out the truth, but in order to find what may authorize their own opinions. Nor is it, indeed, otherwise to be accounted for, that the several partizans of such an endless variety of adverse sects (although men who, on other subjects, appear neither weak nor unfair, in their researches) should all, with so much confidence, maintain that the dictates of holy writ are perfectly decisive, in support of their favorite dogmas, and in opposition to those of every antagonist. Nor is there, in the whole history of mankind, a clearer demonstration than this, of the amazing power of prejudice and prepossession.

It may be said, that interest often warps men's judgment, and gives them a bias towards that side of a question in which they find their account; nay, it may even be urged further that, in cases in which it has no influence on the head, it may seduce the heart, and excite strenuous combatants in defence of a system which they themselves do not believe. I acknowledge that these suppositions are not of things impossible. Actual instances may be found of both. But, for the honour of hu-

man nature, I would wish to think that those of the second class now mentioned, are far from being numerous. But, whatever be in this, we certainly have, in cases wherein interest is entirely out of the question, nay, wherein it appears evidently on the opposite side, irrefragable proofs of the power of prepossession, insomuch that one would almost imagine that, in matters of opinion, as in matters of property, a right were constituted, merely by preoccupation. This serves also to account, in part, for the great diversity of sentiments in regard to the sense of Scripture, without recurring to the common plea of the Romanists, its obscurity and ambiguity.

§ 8. THUS the principal difficulties to be encountered in the study of Biblical criticism are six, arising, 1st, from the singularity of Jewish customs ; 2dly, from the poverty (as appears) of their native language ; 3dly, from the fewness of the books extant in it ; 4thly, from the symbolical style of the prophets ; 5thly, from the excessive influence which a previous acquaintance with translations may have occasioned ; and, 6thly, from prepossessions, in what way soever acquired, in regard to religious tenets.

Dissertation the Third.

*Of the Style of the Scripture History, particularly the Gospels.
Its Perspicuity defended against the Objections of Father
Simon.*

FROM what has been evinced in the preceding discourse, it will, not improbably, be concluded that the style of holy writ, both of the New Testament, and of the Old, of the historical books, as well as of the prophetical, and the argumentative, must be generally obscure, and often ambiguous. So much, and with so great plausibility and acuteness, has been written, by some learned men, in proving this point, that were a person, before he ever read the Scriptures, either in the original, or in a translation, to consider every topic they have employed, and to observe how much, in regard to the truth of such topics, is admitted by those who cannot entirely acquiesce in the conclusion, he would infallibly despair of reaping any instruction, that could be depended on, from the study of the Bible; and would be almost tempted to pronounce it altogether unprofitable.

What can exceed the declarations, to this purpose, of the celebrated Father Simon, a very emi-

nent critic, and probably the greatest oriental scholar of his age? "We ought," says he⁴⁸, "to regard it as unquestionable, that the greater part of the Hebrew words are equivocal, and that their signification is *entirely* uncertain. For this reason, when a translator employs in his version the interpretation which he thinks the best, he cannot say absolutely that that interpretation expresses truly what is contained in the original. There is *always* ground to doubt whether the sense which he gives to the Hebrew words be the true sense, because there are other meanings which are *equally* probable." Again⁴⁹, "They [the Protestants] do not consider that even the most learned Jews doubt almost every where concerning the proper signification of the Hebrew words, and that the Hebrew lexicons composed by them, commonly contain nothing but uncertain conjectures." Now, if matters were really

⁴⁸ Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. iii. ch. ii. On doit supposer comme une chose constante, que la plus part des mots Hebreux sont equivoques, et que leur signification est *entierement* incertaine. C'est pourquoi lors qu'un traducteur employe dans sa version l'interpretation qu'il juge la meilleure, on ne peut pas dire absolument, que cette interpretation exprime au vrai ce qui est contenu dans l'original. Il y a *toujours* lieu de douter, si le sens qu'on donne aux mots Hebreux est le veritable, puis qu'il y en a d'autres qui ont *autant* de probabilité.

⁴⁹ Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. iii. ch. iv. Ils n'ont pas pris garde, que même les plus scavans Juifs doutent presque par tout de la signification propre des mots Hebreux, et que les dictionnaires qu'ils ont composés de la langue Hebraique ne contiennent le plus souvent que de conjectures incertaines.

as here represented, there could be no question that the study of Scripture would be mere loss of time, and that, whatever might be affirmed of the ages of the ancient prophets, it could not be said at present, that there is any revelation extant of what preceded the times of the Apostles. For a revelation which contains nothing but matter of doubt and conjecture, and from which I cannot raise even a probable opinion that is not counter-balanced by opinions equally probable, is no revelation at all. How defective, on this hypothesis, the New Testament would be, which every where presupposes the knowledge and belief of the Old; and, in many places, how inexplicable without that knowledge, it is needless to mention.

§ 2. IT would not be easy to account for exaggerations so extravagant, in an author so judicious, and commonly so moderate, but by observing that his immediate aim, whereof he never loses sight, throughout his whole elaborate performance, is to establish TRADITION, as the foundation of all the knowledge necessary for the faith and practice of a Christian. *Scripture*, doubtless, has its difficulties; but we know at least what, and where it is. As for *tradition*, what it is, how it is to be sought, and where it is to be found, it has never yet been in the power of any man to explain, to the satisfaction of a reasonable inquirer. We are already in possession of the former, if we can but expound it. We cannot say so much of the latter, which, like Nebuchad-

nezzar's dream, we have first to find, and then to interpret.

I am not ignorant that Simon's principal aim has been represented by some of his own communion, particularly Bossuet bishop of Meaux, as still more hostile to religion, than from the account above given we should conclude it to be. That celebrated and subtle disputant did not hesitate to maintain that, under the specious pretext of supporting the church, this priest of the Oratory undermined Christianity itself, a proceeding which, in the end, must prove fatal to an authority that has no other foundation to rest upon. The Bishop accordingly insists that the general tendency of his argument, as appears in every part of the work, is to insinuate a refined Socinianism, if not an universal scepticism. Certain it is, that the ambiguous manner often adopted by our critical historian, and the address with which he sometimes eludes the expectation of his readers, add not a little probability to the reasoning of this acute antagonist. When to any flagrant misinterpretation of a portion of Scripture mentioned in his work, we expect his answer from a critical examination of the passage, we are silenced with the tradition and authority of the church, urged in such a way as evidently suggests, that without recurring to her decision, there is no possibility of refuting the objections of adversaries, or discovering the truth; and that our own reasonings, unchecked by her, if they did not subvert our faith altogether, would infallibly plunge us into all the errors of Socinus. Thus most of his discussions concern-

ing the import of the sacred text conclude in an alternative which, whilst it conceals his own sentiments, bewilders his readers. The purport is, 'If ye will be rational, ye must soon cease to be Christians; and if ye will be Christians, ye must (wherever religion is concerned) cease to be rational.' This alternative of *faith* or *reason*, though not expressed in so many words, is but too plainly implied in those he uses. If for *Christian* he had substituted *Roman Catholic*, or even any one denomination of Christians, the sentiment would not have been so generally controverted. As it is, he offers no other choice, but to believe every thing, how absurd soever, on an authority into the foundation of which we are not permitted to inquire, or to believe nothing at all. The Critical History has accordingly been observed to produce two contrary effects on readers of opposite characters. Of the weak and timid it often makes *implicit believers*; of the intelligent and daring it makes *free-thinkers*. To which side the author himself leaned most, it would perhaps be presumptuous to say. But as his personal character and known abilities were much more congenial to those of the latter class than to those of the former, it was no wonder that he fell under suspicion with some shrewd but zealous Catholics, who looked on his zeal for tradition as no better than a disguise. But this only by the way. I mean not to consider here what was his real and ultimate scope in the treatise above mentioned: it is enough for my purpose to ex-

amine his professed intention, which is to support tradition by representing Scripture as, in consequence of its obscurity, insufficient evidence of any doctrine.

That Simon's assertions above quoted are without bounds hyperbolic, can scarcely be doubted by any person who reflects. Of the prophetic writings I am not now to speak, though even, with regard to them, it were easy to show that such things could not be affirmed, in an entire consistency with truth. As to the historical books, I hope to prove, notwithstanding all that has been evinced on one side, and admitted on the other, that they are, in general, remarkable for perspicuity. It is true that our knowledge of the tongue, for the reasons above mentioned, is defective; but it is also true, that this defect is seldom so great as materially to darken the history, especially the more early part of it.

§ 3. THE first quality for which the sacred history is remarkable is simplicity. The Hebrew is a simple language. Their verbs have not, like Greek and Latin, a variety of moods and tenses, nor do they, like the modern languages, abound in auxiliaries and conjunctions. The consequence is, that in narrative they express by several simple sentences, much in the way of the relations usual in conversation, what in most other languages would be comprehended in one complex sentence of three or four members. Though the latter method has many advantages, in respect of elegance, harmony, and variety, and is essential

to what is strictly called style; the former is incomparably more perspicuous. Accordingly we may often observe that unlettered people who are very attentive to a familiar story told in their own homely manner, and perfectly understand it, quickly lose attention to almost any written history, even the most interesting, the history contained in the Scriptures alone excepted. Nor is the sole reason of this exception, because they are more accustomed to that history than to any other, though no doubt this circumstance contributes to the effect; but it is chiefly because the simplicity of the diction brings it to the level of ordinary talk, and consequently does not put the minds of people who are no readers, so much to the stretch, as what is written, even in the least laboured style of composition, in any modern tongue, does in regard to those acquainted with the tongue.

§ 4. TAKE for an example of the simplicity here meant, the first paragraph of Genesis, consisting of five not long verses, and containing not fewer than eleven sentences. The common punctuation does not indeed make them so many. When sentences are very short, we usually separate them by semicolons, sometimes by commas; but that is a complete sentence, in whatever way pointed, which conveys a meaning fully enunciated, and intelligible, independently of what precedes or what follows; when what precedes, and what follows, is also intelligible, independently of it. 1. *In the beginning God created the heaven*

and the earth. 2. And the earth was without form and void. 3. And darkness was upon the face of the deep. 4. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. 5. And God said, Let there be light. 6. And there was light. 7. And God saw the light, that it was good. 8. And God divided the light from the darkness. 9. And God called the light day. 10. And the darkness he called night. 11. And the evening and the morning were the first day. This is a just representation of the strain of the original. A more perfect example of simplicity of structure we can nowhere find. The sentences are simple; the substantives are not attended by adjectives, nor the verbs by adverbs, no synonymas, no superlatives, no effort at expressing things in a bold, emphatical, or uncommon manner.

In order to judge of the difference of this manner from that of ordinary compositions, we need only compare with it Castalio's version of the passage into Latin, wherein all, except the first sentence and the last, and consequently nine of those above recited, are comprised in one complicated period. "1. *Principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram.* 2. *Quum autem esset terra iners atque rudis, tenebrisque effusum profundum, et divinus spiritus sese super aquas libraret, jussit Deus ut existeret lux, et extitit lux; quam quum videret Deus esse bonam, lucem secrevit a tenebris, et lucem diem, et tenebras noctem appellavit.* 3. *Ita extitit ex vespere et mane dies primus.*" Compare with this the version of the same passage in the Vulgate, which is literal like the English.

“*In principio creavit Deus cœlum et terram.*
 “*Terra autem erat inanis et vacua, et tenebræ*
 “*erant super faciem abyssi: Et spiritus Dei*
 “*ferebatur super aquas. Dixitque Deus, Fiat*
 “*lux. Et facta est lux. Et vidit Deus lucem*
 “*quod esset bona. Et divisit lucem a tenebris.*
 “*Appellavitque lucem diem, et tenebras noctem.*
 “*Factumque est vespere et mane dies unus.”*
 The difference between these in point of perspicuity, is to an ordinary hearer extremely great. So much depends on the simplicity of structure, necessarily arising, in some degree, from the form of the language. Nothing is more characteristic of the simple manner than the introduction of what was spoken, directly in the words of the speaker; whereas, in the periodic style, we are informed obliquely of its purport. Thus what is in the Vulgate, “*Dixit Deus, Fiat lux,*” is in Castalio, “*Jussit Deus ut existeret lux.*”

§ 5. BUT beside this, there is a simplicity of sentiment, particularly in the Pentateuch, arising from the very nature of the early and uncultivated state of society about which that book is conversant. This renders the narrative in general extremely clear and engaging. Simple manners are more easily described than manners highly polished and refined. Being also adapted to the ordinary ranks of people, and to all capacities, they much more generally excite attention, and interest the heart. It has been remarked, not unjustly, that though no two authors wrote in

languages more widely different both in genius and in form, than Moses and Homer, or treated of people who in their religious opinions and ceremonies were more opposite than were the Hebrews and the Greeks, we shall hardly find any who resemble one another more than these writers, in an affecting and perspicuous simplicity, which suits almost every taste, and is level to every understanding. Let it be observed that, in this comparison, I have no allusion to imagery, or to any quality of diction, except that above mentioned. Now nothing contributes more to this resemblance than this circumstance which they have in common, that both present to our view a rude, because little cultivated, state of human beings and politics. The passions and the motives of the men recorded by them, display themselves without disguise. There is something wonderfully simple, and artless, even in the artifices related in their writings. If nature be not always exhibited by them naked, she is dressed in a plain decent garb, which, far from disguising, accommodates her, and shows her to advantage. Natural beauties please always, and universally; artificial ornaments depend, for their effect, on mode and caprice. They please particular persons only, or nations, and at particular times. Now, as the writers above mentioned, though in many respects very dissimilar, resemble each other in this species of simplicity, they also resemble in a certain native perspicuity invariably resulting therefrom.

§ 6. HOMER is thought by many the most perspicuous writer in Greek; yet, in respect of idiom and dialect, he is so peculiar, that one is less assisted to understand him by the other compositions in the language, than to understand any other Greek writer in prose or verse. One would almost think that the only usage in the tongue which can enable us to read him, is his own. Were we, therefore, to judge from general topics which might plausibly be descanted upon, we should conclude that the Iliad and the Odyssey are among the darkest books in the language; yet they are in fact the clearest. In matters of criticism, it is likewise unsafe to form general conclusions from a few examples, which may be pompously displayed, and, when brought into view together, made appear considerable, but are as nothing in number, compared with those with which it is possible to contrast them.

§ 7. INDEED most of Simon's instances, in support of his doctrine of the impenetrable darkness of Scripture, appear to me rather as evidences of the strait he was in to find apposite examples, than as tolerable proofs of his opinion. For my part, I frankly own that, from the conviction I had of the profound erudition and great abilities of the man, I was much more inclined to his opinion before, than after the perusal of his proofs. At first, I could not avoid suspecting that a man of his character must have had something extraordinary, to which I had not attended, to advance,

in support of so extraordinary a position. I was at the same time certain that, as it was a point he had much at heart to enforce, the proofs he would bring from examples in support of it, would be the strongest he could find.

Let us then consider some of the principal of these examples. What pains has he not taken to shew that בָּרָא *bara*, does not necessarily imply, *to make out of nothing*? But if it do not, can any man consider this as an evidence of either the ambiguity, or the obscurity, of Hebrew? The doctrine that God made the world out of nothing, does not rest upon the import of that verb, but on the whole narration, particularly, on the first verse of Genesis compared with those which follow; whence we learn that God first made the chaotic matter, out of which he afterwards formed the material beings whereof the world is composed. But passing this; for I mean not here to inquire into the grounds of that article, but into the obscurity of Scripture; who sees not that the original term is not more ambiguous, or more obscure, than those by which it is rendered into other languages? Is ποιεω , or even κτιζω in Greek, *creo* in Latin, or *create* in English, more definite? Not in the least, as we may learn from the common dictionaries of these languages. In regard even to the scriptural use of the English word, God, in the two first chapters of Genesis, is said, in the common version, to have *created* those very things, of which we are also told, that he formed them out of the ground and out of the water. Are these languages then

(and as much may be said of all the languages I know) perfectly ambiguous and obscure? "It is," says Simon⁵⁰, "the tradition of the synagogue and of the church, which limits the vague meaning of these first words of Genesis." But, if words be accounted *vague*, because they are general expressions, under which several terms more special are included, the much greater part of the nouns as well as the verbs, not of the oriental tongues only, but of every tongue, ancient and modern, must be denominated vague. Every name must be so that is not a proper name; the name of a species, because applicable to many individuals; more so the name of a genus, because applicable to many species; and still more so, the name of a class or order, because applicable to many genera.

Would it not be an abuse of words to say that a man spoke vaguely, equivocally, or darkly, who told me that he had built a *house* for himself; because the verb *to build* does not suggest what the materials of the building were, whether stone, or brick, or wood, to any of which it may be equally applied; and because the noun *house* may equally denote a house of one story, or of seven stories, forty feet long, or four hundred? As far as the information went, the expression was clear and unequivocal. But it did not preclude the possibility of farther information on the subject. And what single affirmation ever does pre-

⁵⁰ Reponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hollande, ch. 16.

clude this? Are we informed of nothing when we are told that God *made all things*? And if it should be added *out of nothing*, would not this be accounted additional information, and not the removal of any obscurity in the foregoing? Would we not judge in the same manner, should a man, after acquainting us that he had built his house, add, that it was of marble, seventy feet long, and three stories high? Yet there would be still scope for further inquiry, and further information. Is a man told nothing who is not told every thing? And is every word obscure or ambiguous, that does not convey all the information that can be given upon the subject? This way of proving, adopted by our learned critic, is indeed a novelty of its kind.

§ 8. ANOTHER of his examples is the word *צבא* *tsaba*⁵¹, rendered by the Seventy *κοσμος*, in the Vulgate *ornatus*, and by our translators *host*. Though this word be admitted to be equivocal taken by itself, as most nouns in every language are, its import in this passage is clearly ascertained by the context to be metaphorical. Whether therefore it be rendered *host* with the English interpreters, *κοσμος* with the Greek, or *ornatus* with the Latin, it makes no conceivable variation in the sense. Nobody, in reading our translation, ever thinks of an army of men, in the literal acceptance, mustered in the sky. Nor is the diversity

⁵¹ Gen. ii. 1. The whole verse is in the common version: *Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.*

at all material, when the purport of the whole sentence is considered, between the different versions which have been given of the two Hebrew words תהו *thohu* and בהו *bohu*⁵². All concur in making them expressive of a chaos.

§ 9. As to the version which, according to him, may be given to the three first verses of Genesis⁵³, making of five or six simple sentences, one complex period, little more is necessary, than to remark that its very want of simplicity in such a book, written in so early an age, is a very strong presumption against it, being not less unsuited to the time of the historian, than it is to the genius of the language. In what respect he could call it literal, or agreeable to the grammatical sense, I do not know; since it evidently departs from the ordinary import, as well as the usual construction of the words, and that not for giving

⁵² Rendered in the English translation, *without form and void*, Gen. i. 2.

⁵³ The version is, "*Avant que Dieu crea le ciel et la terre, que la terre estoit sans forme, &c. que les tenebres estoient, &c. et que l'esprit de Dieu, &c. Dieu dit que la lumiere soit,*" &c. Literally in English, *Before that God created the heavens and the earth, that the earth was without form and void, that darkness was upon the face of the deep, and that the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; God said, Let there be light, and there was light.* Hist. Crit. de V. T. liv. iii. ch. iii. He mentions also another rendering: *Au commencement que,* &c. But this seems only a more awkward way of expressing the same thing.

light to a passage otherwise obscure (which may reasonably excuse a small deviation from the letter), but for involving in darkness what is expressed perspicuously. It is, besides, quite arbitrary. The copulative is thrice rendered "*Que,*" *that*; the fourth time it is omitted; and what follows is in the perfect of the indicative, the preceding clauses being in the potential or subjunctive mood. Now I may venture to affirm, that no conceivable reason can be assigned why this clause should be made choice of for the direct affirmation, and not of any of those preceding or following in the paragraph.

Add to all this, that to make בראשית *bereshith*, a conjunction, and render it "*priusquam,*" *avant que*, is not only without, but against Biblical authority. ראשית *beginning*, is a very common noun, and joined with the prepositive ב signifying *in*, occurs in four places beside this. In these it is uniformly rendered as here, *εν αρχη* in the Septuagint, and *in principio* in the Vulgate, and cannot, in a consistency with the words connected, be rendered otherwise. In the Targum or Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos on the books of Moses, which in point of antiquity comes next to the Septuagint, it is rendered בקרמין *in principiis*, in conformity to every other known translation.

The opinion of Grotius and some learned Rabbies, unsupported by either argument or example, nay, in manifest contradiction to both, is here of no weight. Scriptural usage alone must decide the question. These commentators, (with all de-

ference to their erudition and abilities be it spoken) being comparatively modern, cannot be considered as ultimate judges on a question depending entirely on an ancient use, whereof all the evidences that were remaining in their time, remain still, and are as open to our examination, as they were to theirs. In other points where there may happen to be in Scripture an allusion to customs or ceremonies, retained by the Jews, but unknown to us, the case is different. But nothing of this kind is pretended here. It is therefore needless to enter further into particulars.—What has been produced above will serve for a specimen of the evidence, brought by Father Simon, of the obscurity of the Hebrew Scriptures. And I imagine that, by the like arguments, I might undertake to prove any writing, ancient or modern, to be vague, ambiguous, and obscure.

§ 10. THAT some things, however, in the sacred history, not of great consequence, are ambiguous, and some things obscure, it was never my intention to question. But such things are to be found, in every composition; in every language. Indeed, as the word *perspicuous* is a relative term (for that may be perspicuous to one which is obscure to another), it must be allowed also that the dead languages have, in this respect, a disadvantage, which is always the greater, the less the language is known. As to the multiplicity of meanings sometimes affixed to single words, one would be at a loss to say what tongue, ancient or modern, is most chargeable with this blemish. Any

person accustomed to consult lexicons will readily assent to what I say. In regard to English (in which we know that it is not impossible to write both unambiguously and perspicuously), if we recur to Johnson's valuable Dictionary for the signification of the most common terms, both nouns and verbs, and overlook, for a moment, our acquaintance with the tongue, confirmed by long and uninterrupted habit, we shall be surprised that people can write intelligibly in it, and be apt to imagine that, in every period, nay, in every line, a reader will be perplexed in selecting the proper, out of such an immense variety of meanings as are given to the different words⁵⁴. In this view of things the explanation of a simple sentence will appear like the solution of a riddle.

§ 11. BUT no sooner do we return to practice, than these imaginations, founded merely on a theoretical and partial view of the subject, totally disappear. Nothing can be more pertinent, or better founded, than the remark of Mr. Le Clerc, "That a word which is equivocal by itself, " is often so clearly limited to a particular signification by the strain of the discourse, as to

⁵⁴ Thus to the noun *word* Johnson assigns 12 significations—to *power* 13, and to *foot* 16. The verb *to make* has, according to him, 66 meanings, *to put* 80, and *to take*, which is both neuter and active, has 134. This is but a small specimen in nouns and verbs; the observation may be as amply illustrated in the other parts of speech.

“leave no room for doubt.” Nor has Simon paid a due regard to this most evident truth, though he pretends, in answering that writer, to have been aware of it⁵⁵. He could not otherwise have run into such exaggerations as these: “The signification of the greater part of the Hebrew words is *entirely* uncertain;” and “a translator cannot say absolutely, that his interpretation expresses truly what is contained in the original, there being *always* ground to doubt, because there are other meanings which are *equally probable* ;” absurdities, which it were easy to confute from his own work, were this the proper place.

§ 12. It may be asked in reply, But is not the poverty of the Hebrew tongue, of which the obscurity and the ambiguity seem to be the natural consequences, acknowledged by all impartial critics? In some sense it is, and I have acknowledged it very amply: but it deserves our notice, that much more has been inferred from this than there is foundation for. The language of a people little advanced in civilization, amongst whom knowledge of any kind has made but inconsiderable progress, and the arts of life are yet rude and imperfect, can hardly be supposed copious. But it is not sufficiently weighed, on the other hand, that, if their words be few, their ideas are few in proportion. Words multiply with the occasions

⁵⁵ Reponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Holl. ch. xvi.

for employing them. And if, in modern languages, we have thousands of names, to which we can find none in Hebrew corresponding, we shall discover, upon inquiry, that the Hebrews were ignorant of the things to which those names are affixed by us as the signs.

Knowledge precedes, language follows. No people have names for things unknown and unimagined, about which they can have no conversation. If they be well supplied in signs for expressing those things with which they are, either in reality, or in imagination, acquainted, their language, considered relatively to the needs of the people who use it, may be termed copious; though, compared with the languages of more intelligent and civilized nations, it be accounted scanty. This is a scantiness, which might occasion difficulty to a stranger attempting to translate into it the writings of a more polished and improved people, who have more ideas as well as words, but would never be felt by the natives; nor would it hurt, in the least, the clearness of their narratives, concerning those matters which fall within the sphere of their knowledge. There is no defect of signs for all the things which they can speak or write about, and it can never affect the perspicuity of what they do say, that they have no signs for those things whereof they have nothing to say, because they know nothing about them.

Nay, it may be reasonably inferred that, in what is called a scanty language, where the signs are few, because the things to be signified are few,

there is a greater probability of precision than in a copious language, where the requisite signs are much more numerous, by reason of the multiplicity of things to be represented by them. The least deviation from order will be observed in a small company, which would be overlooked in a crowd. The source of much false reasoning on this head, is the tendency people have to imagine that, with the same extent of subject which might have employed the pen of an ancient Greek, the Hebrews had perhaps not one fourth part of their number of words. Had this been the case, the words must indeed have been used very indefinitely. But as the case really stood, it is not so easy to decide, whether the terms (those especially for which there is most occasion in narrative) be more vague in their signification in Hebrew, than in other languages.

§ 13. BUT, to descend from abstract reasoning to matters of fact, which in subjects of this kind, are more convincing, “It is false,” says Le Clerc, “that there is always ground to doubt whether “the sense which one gives to the Hebrew words “be the true sense; for, in spite of all the ambiguities of the Hebrew tongue, all the interpreters of Scripture, ancient and modern, agree “with regard to the greater part of the history, “and of the Jewish religion.” Le Clerc is rather modest in his assertions: but in fact he was too much of Simon’s opinion on this article, as appears particularly from his Prolegomena to the

Pentateuch⁵⁶. Otherwise he might have justly asserted that the points rendered doubtful by the obscurity or the ambiguity of the text, bear not to those which are evident, the proportion of one to an hundred in number, and not of one to a thousand in importance. Let it be observed that I speak only of the doubts arising from the obscurity of Scripture; for, as to those which may be started by curiosity concerning circumstances not mentioned, such doubts are, on every subject, sacred and profane, innumerable. But in questions of this sort, it is a maxim with every true and consistent Protestant, that the faith of a Christian is not concerned.

Simon's reply is affectedly evasive. At the same time that it, in fact, includes a concession subversive of the principles he had advanced, it is far short of what every person of reflection must see to be the truth. He tells us that "he never doubted, that one might understand Hebrew well enough to know *in gross* and *in general*, the Biblical histories; but this *general* and *confused* knowledge does not suffice for fixing the mind in what regards the articles of our belief⁵⁷." Now what this author meant by *knowing in gross*

⁵⁶ Dissert. I. chap. vi.

⁵⁷ "Mr. Simon n'a jamais douté qu'on n'eut assez de connoissance de la langue Hébraïque pour savoir *en gros* et *en general* les histoires de la Bible. Mais cette connoissance *generale* et *confuse* ne suffit pas pour arrêter l'esprit dans ce qui regarde les points de nôtre creance." Reponse aux Sentimens de quelq. Theolog. de Holl. ch. xvi.

and *in general*, (which is a more vague expression than any I remember in the Pentateuch,) I will not attempt to explain; but it is not in my power to conceive any kind of knowledge, gross or pure, general or special, deducible from a writing wherein “there is *always* ground to doubt whether “the sense assigned be the true sense, because “there are other meanings which are *equally* probable.” There is in these positions a manifest contradiction. When the probabilities in the opposite scales balance each other, there can result no knowledge, no nor even a reasonable opinion. The mind is in total suspense between the contrary, but equal, evidences.

§ 14. BUT, to be more particular; what historical point of moment recorded in Genesis, is interpreted differently by Jews of any denomination, Pharisees, Sadducees, Karaites, Rabbinists, or even Samaritans? Let it be observed that I speak only of their literal or grammatical interpretations of the acknowledged text, and neither of their interpolations, nor of their mystical expositions and allegories, which are as various as men’s imaginations: for with these it is evident that the perspicuity of the tongue is no way concerned. Or is there one material difference, in what concerns the history, among Christians of adverse sects, Greeks, Romanists, and Protestants; or even between Jews and Christians? This book has been translated into a great many languages, ancient and modern, into those of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Is not every thing that can be denominated an event

of consequence similarly exhibited in them all? In all we find one God, and only one, the maker of heaven and earth, and of every thing that they contain. From all we learn that the world was made in six days, that God rested the seventh. All agree in the work of each day, in giving man dominion over the brute creation, in the formation of the woman out of the body of the man, in the prohibition of the tree of knowledge, in man's transgression and its consequences, in the murder of Abel by his brother Cain, in the deluge, in the preservation of Noah's family, and of the animal world, by the ark, in the confusion of tongues, in the histories given of the patriarchs.

It were tedious, I had almost said endless, to enumerate every thing. Take the story of Joseph for an example, the only one I shall specify. In what version of that most interesting narrative, oriental or occidental, ancient or modern, Jewish or Christian, Popish or Protestant, is any thing which can be justly called material, represented differently from what it is in the rest? Do we not clearly perceive in every one of them the partiality of the parent, the innocent simplicity of the child, the malignant envy of the brothers, their barbarous purpose so cruelly executed, their artifice for deceiving their father, the young man's slavery in Egypt, his prudence, fidelity, piety, chastity, the infamous attempt of his mistress, and the terrible revenge she took of his virtuous refusal, his imprisonment, his behaviour in prison, the occasion of his release, Pharaoh's dreams, and Joseph's interpretation, the exaltation of the latter in

Egypt, the years of plenty and the years of famine, the interviews he had with his brothers, and the affecting manner in which he, at last, discovered himself to them? Is there any one moral lesson that may be deduced from any part of this history, (and none surely can be more instructive,) which is not sufficiently supported by every translation with which we are acquainted? Or is this coincidence of translations, in every material circumstance, consistent with the representations which have been given of the total obscurity and ambiguity of the original? The reverse certainly.

§ 15. NOR is it necessary, in this inquiry, to confine one's self to the points merely historical, though, for brevity's sake, I have done it. Permit me only to add in a sentence, that the religious institutions, the laws and the ceremonies of the Jews, as far as they are founded on the express words of Scripture, and neither on tradition, nor on traditionary glosses, are, in every thing material, understood in the very same way, by both Jews and Christians. The principal points on which the Jewish sects differ so widely from one another, are supported, if not by the oral traditive law, at least by mystical senses, attributed by one party, and not acquiesced in by others, to those passages of Scripture, about the literal meaning whereof all parties are agreed.

§ 16. YET our critic will have it, that our knowledge of these things is *confused* and *gene-*

ral. He had granted more, as we have seen, than was compatible with his bold assertions above quoted; and therefore to disguise a little the inconsistency of those assertions with the concession now made, he encumbers it with the epithets *confused and general*. But let the fact speak for itself. Had there been any source of confusion in the original, was it possible that there should have been such a harmony in translations made into languages so different, and by men who, in many things that concern religion, were of sentiments so contrary? But if this knowledge be *confused and general*, I should like to be informed what this author, and those who think as he does, would denominate *distinct and particular*. For my part, I have not a more distinct and particular notion of any history, I ever read, in any language, than of that written by Moses. And if there has not been such a profusion of criticism on the obscurities and ambiguities which occur in other authors, it is to be ascribed solely to this circumstance, that what claims to be matter of revelation, awakens a closer attention, and excites a more scrupulous examination, than any other performance which, how valuable soever, is infinitely less interesting to mankind. Nor is there a single principle by which our knowledge of the import of sacred writ, especially in what relates to Jewish and Christian antiquities, could be overturned, that would not equally involve all ancient literature in universal scepticism.

§ 17. SOME perhaps will be ready to conclude from what has been advanced, that all new translations of Scripture must be superfluous, since the language is so clear, that no preceding translator has missed the sense in points of consequence. It is indeed true, that no translator, that I know, has missed the sense in points of principal consequence, whether historical events, articles of faith, or rules of practice; insomuch that we may with Brown safely desire the sceptic⁵⁸, “to chuse
“which he should like best or worst among
“all the controverted copies, various readings,
“manuscripts, and catalogues, adopted by what-
“ever church, sect, or party; or even any of
“the almost infinite number of translations made
“of these books in distant countries and ages, re-
“lying on it as amply sufficient for all the great
“purposes of religion and christianity.”

Yet it is not to be argued that, because the worst copy or translation contains all the essentials of religion, it is not of real consequence, by being acquainted with the best, to guard against errors, which, though comparatively of smaller moment, and not subversive of the foundation, impair the integrity, and often injure the consistency, as well as weaken the evidence, of our religious knowledge. Although the most essential truths are the most obvious, and accessible to the unlearned, as well as to the learned, we ought not to think lightly of any advances attainable in the divine science. There is a satisfaction which the well-

⁵⁸ Essays on the Characteristics, Ess III. Sect. iii.

disposed mind receives from an increase of knowledge, that of itself does more than repay all the labour employed in the acquisition. If this hold, even in ordinary subjects, how much more in the most sublime? There is, besides, such a symmetry of parts in the divine institution we have by Jesus Christ, that a more thorough acquaintance with each part, serves to illustrate the other parts, and confirm our faith in the whole. And whatever in any degree corroborates our faith, contributes in the same degree to strengthen our hope, to enhance our love, and to give additional weight to all the motives with which our religion supplies us, to a pious and virtuous life.

These are reasons which ought to weigh with every Christian, and the more especially, as the most minute examination will never be found an unprofitable study, even to the most learned. It is with the good things of the Spirit, as with what are called the good things of life; the most necessary are the most common, and the most easily acquired. But as, in regard to the animal life, it would be a reproach on those possessed of natural abilities, through torpid indolence, to look no further than mere necessaries, not exerting their powers for the attainment of those conveniencies whereby their lives might be rendered both more comfortable to themselves, and more beneficial to others; it is, beyond compare, more blameworthy to betray the same lazy disposition, and the same indifference, in what concerns the spiritual life. Barely to have faith, does not satisfy the mind of

the pious Christian, whose ambition it is to be rich in faith. To have received of the celestial grace is not enough in point, either of acquirement, or of evidence, to him whose ardent and daily desire it is to grow in grace, and in the comfort of God's Spirit. Now, to make progress in divine knowledge, is (if I may be allowed the similitude) to improve the soil in which faith, and hope, and charity, and all the graces of the Spirit, must be sown and cultivated.

§ 18. BUT, to return to the style of the sacred history, from which I fear this controversy, though exceedingly important, and intimately connected with the subject, has made me digress too far; there is another species of simplicity, besides the simplicity of structure, and the simplicity of sentiment above mentioned, for which, beyond all the compositions I know in any language, Scripture history is remarkable. This may be called simplicity of design. The subject of the narrative so engrosses the attention of the writer, that he is himself as nobody, and is quite forgotten by the reader, who is never led, by the tenour of the narration, so much as to think of him. He introduces nothing as from himself. We have no opinions of his, no remarks, conjectures, doubts, inferences; no reasonings about the causes, or the effects, of what is related. He never interrupts his reader with the display, of either his talents, or his passions. He makes no digressions: he draws no characters: he gives us only the naked facts, from which we are left to collect the character. The utmost

he does in characterizing, and that but seldom, is comprised in a very few words. And what is thus said, is not produced as his opinion, either of the person or of the thing, but as the known verdict of the time, or perhaps, as the decision of the Spirit. No attempt to shine, by means of the expression, composition, or sentiments. Plainness of language is always preferred, because the most natural, the most obvious, and the best adapted to all capacities. Though, in style, by no means slovenly, yet, in little points, as about those grammatical accuracies which do not affect the sense and perspicuity of the sentence, rather careless than curious.

§ 19. Now in the last of the three sorts of simplicity enumerated, our Lord's biographers particularly excel. This quality, or something akin to it, has been much and justly celebrated in some pagan writers, in Xenophon, for instance, among the Greeks, and Cæsar among the Latins. It were easy, however, to show, were it a proper subject of discussion here, that the difference between these and the sacred penmen, especially the Evangelists, is very considerable. In respect of the first species of simplicity mentioned, simplicity of structure, the difference of the genius of the Greek language from that of the Hebrew, must no doubt occasion some difference in the manner of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, from that of Moses; but the identity of idiom explained in a former discourse⁵⁹, occasions still a strong resem-

⁵⁹ Diss. I. Part I.

blance between them. If Genesis, therefore, may be justly said to possess the first rank of simplicity of composition in the sentences, the Gospels are certainly intitled to the second. But even these are not, in this kind, entirely equal among themselves. John and Matthew have it in a higher degree than Mark and Luke.

As to the second species, simplicity of sentiment, arising chiefly from the uncultivated state of society, in the period and country about which the history is conversant; the change of times, which was doubtless very great, as well as the difference of subject, would necessarily confer the first degree here also upon the former. But in what was denominated simplicity of object or design, the Evangelists, of all writers, sacred and profane, appear the foremost. Their manner is indeed, in some respects, peculiar and unrivalled. It may not be amiss to consider a little, the circumstances which gave occasion to this diversity and peculiarity.

§ 20. For this purpose I beg leave to lay before the reader the few following observations. 1st, I observe, that the state and circumstances of things were, before the times of the Apostles, totally changed in Palestine, from what they had been in the times of the Patriarchs. The political alterations gradually brought upon the country, by a succession of revolutions in government, which made their condition so very unlike the pastoral life of their wandering forefathers, are too obvious to need illustration. 2dly, Their

intercourse with strangers of different nations, to some of which they had been successively in subjection, had, notwithstanding their peculiarities in religion, introduced great changes in manners, sentiments, and customs. In our Saviour's days we find the nation divided into religious sects and political parties; the former of which had their respective systems, schools, and patrons among the learned. Each sect had its axioms or leading principles, and its particular mode of reasoning from those principles. Now there is not a single trace of any thing similar to this in all the Old Testament history. 3dly, As the *great* object of our Lord's ministry, which is the *great* subject of the Gospels, was to inculcate a doctrine and morality with which none of their systems perfectly coincided; and as, by consequence, he was opposed, by all the principal men of the different factions then in the nation, the greater part of his history must be employed in relating the instructions which he delivered to the people, and to his disciples, the disputes which he had with his antagonists, and the methods by which he recommended and supported his doctrine, exposed their sophistry, and eluded their malice.

This must give a colour to the history of the Messiah, very different from that of any of the ancient worthies recorded in the Old Testament; in which, though very instructive, there is comparatively little delivered in the didactic style, and hardly any thing in the argumentative. A great deal of both we have in the Gospels. It ought

not here to pass unnoticed, that it is more in compliance with popular language, than in strict propriety, that I denominate his manner of enforcing moral instruction, *arguing*. Our Lord, addressing himself much more to the heart than to the head, and, by his admirable parables, without the form of argument, convincing his hearers, that the moral truths he recommended are conformable to the genuine principles of our nature, in other words, to the dictates of conscience and the common sense of mankind, commands, from the impartial, and the considerate, an unlimited assent. Accordingly, when a similitude, or an example, is made to supply the place of argument, in support of a particular sentiment, he does not formally deduce the conclusion, but either leaves it to the reflections of his hearers, or draws it from their own mouths, by a simple question. This, without the parade of reasoning, is, in practical subjects, the strongest of all reasoning. After candidly stating an apposite case, it is appealing, for the decision, not to the prejudices or the passions, but to the natural sense of good and evil, even of his adversaries. 4thly, As our Lord's history is occupied, partly with what he said, and partly with what he did, this occasions in the Gospels a twofold distinction of style and manner; first, that of our Saviour, as it appears in what he said; secondly, that of his historians, as it appears in their relation of what he did. I shall consider briefly, how the different sorts of simplicity above mentioned may be applied to each of these.

§ 21. As to the simplicity of structure, it may be said in a very eminent degree to belong to both. It is, in itself, regarded more as a quality of narration, but is by no means excluded from the other kinds of composition. Besides, in our Lord's discourses, particularly his parables, there is a great deal of narrative. Simplicity of sentiment appears more in the dialogue part, and in the teaching, than in the narration, which is almost confined to what is necessary for information and connection. It may be objected, that our Lord's figurative manner of teaching is not perfectly compatible with simplicity. But, let it be observed, that there is a simplicity of manner, in the enunciation of the sentiments directly signified, which a piece of writing that admits a figurative or allegorical meaning, is as susceptible of, as one that admits only a literal interpretation. Greece has not produced a more genuine specimen of this than we have in the Apologues of Esop, which are all nevertheless to be understood figuratively. In Cebes's Table, which is an allegory, there is great simplicity of diction. It is only with the expression of the literal or immediate sentiment, that this quality is concerned. And nothing surely can, in this particular, exceed the parables of our Lord. As these are commonly in the style of narration, they are susceptible of the same simplicity of structure as well as of sentiment, with the historian's narrative, and are, in this respect, hardly distinguishable from it.

But the third sort mentioned belongs peculiarly to the historian. In our Lord's discourses, though the general and ultimate object is the same throughout, namely the honour of God by the recovery of men, the particular and immediate object varies with the subject and occasion. At one time it is to instruct his hearers in one important doctrine or duty, at another time in another; sometimes to refute one error, at other times another; now to rebuke what is wrong, then again to encourage in the practice of what is right. We have all the variety of threats and promises, prohibitions and precepts, rebukes and consolations, explanation and refutation, praise and blame. These undoubtedly require a considerable variety in the style and manner. Now, there is occasion for nothing of this kind in the narrative. The historians with whom we are here concerned, do, in their own character, neither explain nor command, promise nor threaten, commend nor blame, but preserve one even tenour in exhibiting the facts entirely unembellished, reporting, in singleness of heart, both what was said, and what was done, by their Master, likewise what was said, and what was done, to him, by either friends or enemies. Not a syllable of encomium on the former, or of invective against the latter. As to their Lord himself, they appear to regard his character as infinitely superior to any praise which they could bestow: and as to his persecutors, they mingle no gall in what they write concerning them; they do not desire to aggravate their

guilt, in the judgment of any man, either by giving expressly, or by so much as insinuating, through the severity of their language, their opinion concerning it.

§ 22. NAY, which is more remarkable, the names of the high-priest and his coadjutor, of the Roman procurator, of the tetrarch of Galilee, and of the treacherous disciple, are all that are mentioned of the many who had a hand in his prosecution, and death. In regard to the four first, it is manifest that the suppression of the names, had the facts been related, would have made no difference to contemporaries; for in offices of so great eminence, possessed by single persons, as all those offices were, the official is equivalent to the proper name, which it never fails to suggest; but such a suppression would have made to posterity a material defect in the history, and greatly impaired its evidence. In regard to the fifth, it is sufficient to observe that, without naming the traitor, justice could not have been done to the eleven. Whereas, of those Scribes and Pharisees who bargained with Judas, of the men who apprehended Jesus, of the officer who struck him on the face at his trial, of the false witnesses who deposed against him, of those who afterwards spat upon him, buffeted and mocked him, of those who were loudest in crying *Away with him; Crucify him; Not this man but Barabbas*; of those who supplied the multitude with the implements of their mockery, the crown of thorns, the reed, and the scarlet robe, of those who upbraided him on the cross

with his inability to save himself; or of the soldier who pierced his side with a spear; no name is given, by any of the historians.

It may be said, 'The names have not been known to them.' This may have been true of some of their names, but cannot be supposed to have been true of them all, and that, with regard not to one, two, or three, but to all the four Evangelists. The witnesses must have been persons of the country, and, at least, occasional hearers of our Lord. It was, no doubt, chiefly the people of Jerusalem, who tumultuously demanded his execution, who derided him with the title of Messiah, and who insulted him even on the cross. Curiosity, on such occasions, leads men to inquire about persons who act a principal part, in a scene so tragical; and, that the disciples were not beyond the influence of this motive, is evident from the whole of the story. The names of the Roman soldiers, concerned in this transaction, might have been unknown to them, and probably little minded by them; but the actions of their countrymen must have excited another kind of emotion, as it more nearly affected all his followers.

Now, this reserve in regard to the names of those who were the chief instruments of his sufferings, is the more observable, as the names of others to whom no special part is attributed, are mentioned without hesitation. Thus Malchus, whose ear Peter cut off, and who was immediately after miraculously cured by Jesus, is named by John; but nothing further is told of him than, that he was present when our Lord was seized, and that

he was a servant of the high-priest. Simon the Cyrenian, who carried the cross, is named by no fewer than three of the Evangelists; but we are also informed that, in this service he did not act voluntarily, but by compulsion. Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus are the only members of the Sanhedrim, except the high-priest, who are mentioned by name; but they were the only persons of that body who did not concur in condemning the Son of God, and who, though once fearful and secret disciples, assumed the resolution to display their affection, at a time when no one else ventured openly to acknowledge him. Our Lord's biographers, whilst they are thus far ready to do justice to merit, avoid naming any man, without necessity, of whom they have nothing to say that is not to his dishonour. To the virtuous and good they conciliate our esteem and love, an effectual method of raising our admiration of virtue and goodness; and exciting in us a noble emulation; but our contempt and hatred they direct against the crimes, not against the persons of men; against vices, not against the vicious; aware that this last direction is often of the most dangerous tendency to Christian charity, and consequently to genuine virtue. They showed no disposition to hold up any man to the Christians of their own time, as an object of either their fear or their abhorrence, or to transmit his name with infamy to posterity.

Though this holds principally in what concerns the last great catastrophe, it appears, in some

degree, in every part of the history. Except in the case of Herodias, which, from the rank of the personages concerned, must have been a matter of notoriety and public scandal, and therefore required a more public reprehension, the names are never mentioned, when what is related reflects disgrace on the persons. Of the Scribes and Pharisees who watched our Lord, and, on different occasions, dissembling esteem, assailed him with captious and ensnaring questions, of those who openly ascribed his miracles to Beelzebub, called him a madman, a demoniac, and what they accounted worse than either, a Samaritan, who accused him of associating with the profligate, of Sabbath-breaking, of intemperance, and blasphemy, of those Sadducees who, by their sophistry, vainly attempted to refute the doctrine of the resurrection, of those enraged Nazarenes his fellow-citizens, who would have carried him by force to a precipice, that they might throw him down headlong, no names are ever mentioned; nor is the young but opulent magistrate named, who came to consult him as to what he must do to obtain eternal life; for though there were some favourable symptoms in his case, yet as, by going away sorrowful, he betrayed a heart wedded to the world, the application did not terminate to his honour. But of Simon the Pharisee, who invited our Lord to his house, and who, though doubtful, seemed inclinable to learn, of Jairus, and Bartimeus, and Zaccheus, and Lazarus, and his sisters Mary and Martha, and some others, of whose faith, repentance, gratitude, love,

and piety, the most honourable testimony is given, a very different account is made.

Some may object that this conduct, in the first disciples, is imputable to a weak and timid policy. They were afraid to raise against themselves powerful enemies, whose vengeance might prove fatal to their persons, and ruinous to their cause. It happens luckily for silencing this pretext, that, in other things, they gave the most unequivocal proofs of their fortitude; besides, that the exceptions above mentioned include almost all the persons possessed of such authority civil or sacred, united with such a disposition, as could render their resentment an object of terror to those who were obnoxious to it. That the difference thus marked between the evil and the good is, on the contrary, in the true spirit of their Master, might be inferred, as from several other passages, so in particular, from that similitude wherein the rewards and punishments of another state are so well exemplified. A name is given to the poor man who was conveyed by angels to Abraham's bosom: the other, who was consigned to torments, is distinguished solely by the epithet *rich*. A particularity from which we may learn an instructive lesson of modesty and caution, in regard to names, when what truth compels us to say, is to the disadvantage of the persons, and that it suffices that we consider particular punishments as suited to particular actions, without referring them to known individuals, or leading the thoughts of others to refer them.

But, as to the penmen themselves, and their fellow-disciples, in recording their own faults, no secret is made of the names. Of this the intemperate zeal of the sons of Zebedee, on one occasion, and their ambition and secular views, on another, the incredulity of Thomas, the presumption of Peter, and his lamentable defection in the denial of his Master, not to mention the prejudices and dulness of them all, are eminent examples. These particulars are all related, by the sacred historians, with the same undisguised plainness, which they use in relating the crimes of adversaries; and with as little endeavour to extenuate the former, as to aggravate the latter. Nor have they, on the other hand, the remotest appearance of making a merit of their confession. In one uniform strain, they record the most signal miracles, and the most ordinary events. In regard to the one, like persons familiarized to such exertions of power, they no more express themselves, either with hesitancy, or with strong asseverations, than they do in regard to the other. Equally certain of the facts advanced, they recite both in the same unvaried tone, as faithful witnesses, whose business it was to testify, and not to argue.

§ 23. HENCE it happens that that quality of style which is called *animation*, is in a manner excluded from the narrative. The historians speak of nothing, not even the most atrocious actions of our Lord's persecutors, with symptoms of emotion; no angry epithet, or pathetic exclamation, ever

escapes them; not a word that betrays passion in the writer, or is calculated to excite the passions of the reader. In displaying the most gracious, as well as marvellous, dispensation of Providence towards man, all is directed to mend his heart, nothing to move his pity, or kindle his resentment. If these effects be also produced, they are manifestly the consequences of the naked exposition of the facts, and not of any adventitious art in the writers, nay not of any one term, not otherwise necessary, employed for the purpose.

I am sensible that to those who are both able and willing to give these writings a critical examination, hardly, in any translation, does this peculiarity appear, so much as it does in the original. Most readers consider *animation* as an excellency in writing; and in ordinary performances, it no doubt is so. By interesting them strongly in the events related, it rouses and quickens their attention. Unanimated simplicity, on the contrary, they call flatness, if not insipidity of manner. In consequence of this general sentiment, when two words occur to a translator, either of which expresses the fact, but one of them does it simply, without any note of either praise or blame, the other with some warmth expressive of censure or approbation; he very naturally prefers the latter, as the more emphatical and affecting. Nor will he be apt to suspect that he is not sufficiently close to the original, if the action or thing alluded to be truly signified, though not entirely in the same manner. Such differences even good trans-

lators, though not insensible of them, are apt to overlook, excusing themselves with the consideration, that words, in all respects, corresponding, in two tongues which differ widely from each other, are not always to be found.

But to explain myself by examples, without which a writer is often but indistinctly understood; in rendering ὁ παραδῶς αὐτον⁶⁰ into Latin; of the two verbs, *tradere* to deliver up, and *prodere* to betray, most translators would prefer the latter, as the more animated. Yet in reality, the former is more conformable to the simplicity of the sacred author, who satisfies himself with acquainting us with the external fact, without characterizing it or insinuating his own opinion; otherwise the term would have been *προδῶς*, not *παραδῶς*. Again, the demonstrative ἐὶς⁶¹ may be rendered into the English either *this man* or *this fellow*. But in the last expression a degree of contempt is suggested, which is not in the first, nor in the original. See the notes on both passages.

§ 24. LET it be observed, that in excluding animation, I, in a great measure, confine myself to the narrative, or what proceeds immediately from the historians. In the discourses and dialogues wherein their Master bears the only, or the principal part; the expression, without losing aught of its proper simplicity, is often remarkable for spirit and energy. There is, in these, an animation, but so

⁶⁰ Matth. x. 4.

⁶¹ Matth. xii. 26.

chastised by candour and strict propriety, as to be easily distinguished from what is often so termed, in other compositions.

Yet here too, the language has sometimes suffered, in the very best translations, and that not so much through the fault of translators, as in consequence of the difference of genius found in different tongues. Some of the epithets employed by our Lord against his antagonists, have not that asperity which all modern versions appear to give them. The Greek word *ὑποκριτης*, for example, as metaphorically used in Scripture, has more latitude of signification than the word *hypocrite* formed from it, as used in modern tongues. The former is alike applicable to all who dissemble on any subject or occasion; the latter is in strictness applied only to those who, in what concerns religion, lead a life of dissimulation. It must be owned, that it is to persons of this character, that it is oftenest applied in the Gospel; but the judicious philologist hardly needs to be informed, that the more the signification of a word is extended, the more vague and general it becomes, and consequently, if a reproachful epithet, the softer. The word *ψευστης*, in like manner, has not that harshness in Greek that *liar* has in English. The reason is the same as in the former instance: for, though often properly rendered *liar*, it is not limited to what we mean by that term. Every man who tells or teaches what is false, whether he know the falsehood of what he says or not, is what the sacred authors justly denominate *ψευστης*, *a false speaker*; but he is not what we call a

liar, unless he knows it to be false, and deceives intentionally. For this reason I have, in some instances⁶², considered it as no more than doing justice to the spirit of the original, to soften the expression in the common version, though otherwise unexceptionable.

On the other hand, the Evangelists, in their own characters, are rarely other than mere narrators, without passions or opinions. In this, as I have said, they differ from Moses and the other historians of the Old Testament, who, though justly celebrated for native simplicity of manner, have not hesitated briefly to characterize the most remarkable persons and actions whereof they have occasion to speak. Without pretending to account entirely for this difference of manner, in writers who spoke by the same Spirit, I shall only submit to the judicious reader the following considerations, which appear to indicate a singular propriety, in the modest reserve of our Lord's biographers.

Moses and the other writers of the Old Testament Scriptures were all prophets, a character with which, considered in a religious light, no merely human character can be compared. None therefore could be better authorized than they, to pronounce directly, on the quality both of the agents and of the actions mentioned in their histories. In this view of the matter, they had no superior, even in the most eminent personages whose lives they recorded. An unreserved plain-

⁶² Matth. xxii. 18. Jo. viii. 55.

ness of censure, or approbation, was, in them, therefore, becoming, as it entirely suited the authority with which they were vested. But was not the situation of the Evangelists, it may be asked, the same in this respect, as they also wrote by inspiration? It is true, they were inspired, and, at least, equally entitled to the prophetic character with any who preceded them; but they were not entirely in the same situation. In the Old Testament, the sacred penmen were the mouth of God to the people. In the Gospels, the writers appear solely as Christ's humble attendants, selected for introducing to the knowledge of others, this infinitely higher character, who is himself, in a supereminent sense, the mouth, the oracle of God. It is this subordinate part of ushers which they professedly act. Like people struck with the ineffable dignity of the Messiah whom they serve, they lose no opportunity of exhibiting him to the world, appearing to consider the introduction of their own opinion, unless where it makes a part of the narration, as an impertinence. As modest pupils, in the presence of so venerable a teacher, they lay their hand upon their mouth, and, by a respectful silence, show how profound their reverence is, and how strong their desire to fix all the attention of mankind upon him. They sink themselves, in order to place him in the most conspicuous point of view: they do more; they, as it were, annihilate themselves, that Jesus may be all in all. Never could it be said of any preachers, with more truth than of them, that they

preached not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Deeply impressed with their Master's instructions, and far from affecting to be called Rabbi, or to be honoured of men as fathers and teachers in things divine, they never allowed themselves to forget that they had only one Father who is in heaven, and only one Teacher the Messiah. The unimpassioned, yet not unfeeling, manner, wherein they relate his cruel sufferings, without letting one harsh or severe epithet escape them, reflecting on the conduct of his enemies, is as unexampled as it is inimitable, and forms an essential distinction between them and all who have either gone before or followed them, literate or illiterate, artful or artless, sceptical or fanatical. For if, in the latter classes, the illiterate, the artless, and the fanatical, fury and hatred flame forth, wherever opposition or contradiction presents them with an occasion; the former, the literate, the artful, and the sceptical, are not less distinguishable for the supercilious and contemptuous manner, in which they treat the opinions of religionists of all denominations. The manner of the Evangelists was equally removed from both. Add to this that, without making the least pretences to learning, they nowhere affect to depreciate it; but, on the contrary, show a readiness to pay all due regard to every useful talent or acquisition.

§ 25. FROM all that has been said I cannot help concluding that, if these men were impostors, agreeably to the infidel hypothesis, they were the

most extraordinary the world ever produced. That they were not philosophers and men of science, we have irrefragable, I had almost said intuitive, evidence; and of what has hitherto been found invariably to mark the character of fanatics and enthusiasts of all religions, we do not discover in them a single trace. Their narratives demonstrate them to have been men of sound minds and cool reflection. To suppose them deceived, in matters which were the objects of their senses; or, if not deceived, to suppose such men to have planned the deception of the world, and to have taken the method which they took, to execute their plan; are alike attended with difficulties insurmountable. The Christian's hypothesis, that they spoke the truth, and were under the influence of the Divine Spirit, removes at once all difficulties, and, in my judgment, (for I have long and often revolved the subject,) is the only hypothesis which ever will, or ever can remove them. But this only by the way.

§ 26. CONCERNING the other qualities of style to be found in these writings, I acknowledge, I have not much to add. Simplicity, gravity, and perspicuity, as necessarily resulting from simplicity, are certainly their predominant characters. But, as in writings it is not always easy to distinguish the qualities arising from the thought, from those arising merely from the expression; I shall consider, in a few sentences, how far the other properties of good writing, commonly attributed to the style, are applicable to the Evangelists. In

what concerns harmony, and qualities which may be called merely superficial, as adding only an external polish to their language; about such, if we may judge from their writings, they do not appear, as was hinted before, to have had any the smallest solicitude. To convey the sense (the only thing of importance enough to be an object to them) in the most familiar, and consequently in the most intelligible, terms to their readers, seems to have been their highest aim in point of style. What concerned the sound alone, and not the sense, was unworthy of their attention.

In regard to elegance, there is an elegance which results from the use of such words as are most in favour with those who are accounted fine writers, and from such an arrangement in the words and clauses, as has generally obtained their approbation. This is still of the nature of *varnish*, and is disclaimed, not studied, by the sacred authors. But there is also an elegance of a superior order, more nearly connected with the sentiment; and in this sort of elegance they are not deficient. In all the Oriental languages great use is made of tropes, especially metaphor. The Scriptures abound with them. When the metaphors employed bear a strong resemblance, and the other tropes are happily adapted, to the subjects they are intended to represent, they confer *vivacity* on the writing. If they be borrowed from objects which are naturally agreeable, beautiful, or attractive, they add also *elegance*. Now of this kind, both of *vivacity* and of *elegance*, the Evangelists furnish us with a variety of examples. Our Lord illus-

trates every thing (agreeably to the use of the age and country) by figures and similies. His tropes are always apposite; and often borrowed from objects naturally engaging. The former quality renders them *lively*, the latter *elegant*. The ideas introduced are frequently those of corn-fields, vineyards, and gardens. The parables are sometimes indeed taken from the customs of princes and grandees, but oftener from the life of shepherds and husbandmen. If those of the first kind confer dignity on the examples, those of the second add an attraction, from the pleasantness of images which recal to the fancy, the thoughts of rural happiness and tranquillity. And even in cases where propriety required that things disagreeable should be introduced, as in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, the whole is conducted with that seriousness, and chaste simplicity of manner, which totally exclude disgust. We may justly say, therefore, that the essential attributes of good writing are not wanting in these histories, though whatever can be considered as calculated for glitter and ostentation, is rather avoided than sought.

§ 27. UPON the whole, therefore, the qualities of the style could not, to those who were not Jews, nor accustomed to their idiom, serve at first to recommend these writings. The phraseology could hardly fail to appear to such, awkward, idiomatical, and even vulgar. In this manner it generally did appear to gentile Greeks, upon the first perusal. But if they were, by any means, induced to give them a second reading, though

still not insensible of the peculiarity, their prejudices and dislike of the idiom rarely failed to subside. A third commonly produced an attachment. The more they became acquainted with these books, the more they discovered of a charm in them, to which they found nothing comparable, or similar, in all that they had learnt before; inso-much that they were not ashamed, nay, they were proud, to be taught by writers, for whose persons and performances they had formerly entertained a sovereign contempt. The persecutors of the church, both Jews and Pagans, perceived, at last, the consequences of conniving at the study of the Scriptures, and were therefore determined to make it their principal object, to effect the suppression of them, particularly of the Gospels. But the more this was attempted, the more were the copies multiplied, the more was the curiosity of mankind excited, and the more was the inestimable treasure of divine knowledge they contained, circulated. Early, and with avidity, were translations demanded, in almost every known tongue. Those Christians who had as much learning as to be capable, were ambitious of contributing their share in diffusing amongst all nations, the delight as well as the instruction, which the study of these books conveyed into the soul. Nor was this admiration of the divine writings to be found only among the vulgar and the ignorant. It is true, it originated among them; but it did not terminate with them. Contrary to the common course of fashion, which descends from the higher ranks to the lower, it arose among the lowest

classes, and ascended to the highest. Not only nobles and senators, but even philosophers and men of letters, the pupils of sophists and rhetoricians, who by the prejudices of their education would be most shocked with the inelegancies, the vulgarisms, and even the barbarisms (as they would account them,) of the sacred writers, found a secret and irresistible attraction, which overcame all their prepossessions, and compelled them to acknowledge, that no writers could so effectually convey conviction to the understanding, and reformation to the heart, as these poor, homely, artless, and unlettered Galileans.

Dissertation the Fourth.

Observations on the Right Method of proceeding in the Critical Examination of the Books of the New Testament.

It was remarked, in a foregoing Dissertation,¹ that, notwithstanding the sameness both of the language and of the idiom employed by the penmen of the New Testament, there is a sensible diversity in their styles. The first general rule, therefore, which demands the attention of him who would employ himself in searching the Scriptures, is to endeavour to get acquainted with each writer's style, and, as he proceeds in the examination, to observe his manner of composition, both in sentences and in paragraphs, to remark the words and phrases peculiar to him, and the peculiar application which he may sometimes make of ordinary words; for there are few of those writers who have not their peculiarities, in all the respects now mentioned. This acquaintance with each can be attained only, by the frequent and attentive reading of his works, in his own language.

¹ Diss. I. Part. II. § 1.

§ 2. THE second general direction is to inquire carefully, as far as is compatible with the distance of time, and the other disadvantages we labour under, into the character, the situation, and the office of the writer, the time, the place, and the occasion, of his writing, and the people for whose immediate use he originally intended his work. Every one of these particulars will sometimes serve to elucidate expressions, otherwise obscure or doubtful. This knowledge may, in part, be learnt from a diligent and reiterated perusal of the book itself, and in part, be gathered from what authentic, or at least probable, accounts have been transmitted to us, concerning the compilement of the canon.

§ 3. THE third, and only other, general direction I shall mention, is, to consider the principal scope of the book, and the particulars chiefly observable in the method by which the writer has purposed to execute his design. This direction, I acknowledge, can hardly be considered as applicable to the historical books, whose purpose is obvious, and whose method is determined by the order of time, or, at least, by the order in which the several occurrences recorded have presented themselves to the memory of the compiler. But, in the epistolary writings, especially those of the Apostle Paul, this consideration would deserve particular attention.

§ 4. Now, to come to rules of a more special nature : If, in reading a particular book, a word or

phrase occur, which appears obscure, perhaps unintelligible, how ought we to proceed? The first thing undoubtedly we have to do, if satisfied that the reading is genuine, is to consult the context, to attend to the manner wherein the term is introduced, whether in a chain of reasoning, or as belonging to a historical narration, as constituting some circumstance in a description, or included in an exhortation or command. As the conclusion is inferred from the premises; or, as from two or more known truths, a third unknown or unobserved before may fairly be deduced; so from such attention to the sentences in connection, the import of an expression, in itself obscure or ambiguous, will sometimes, with moral certainty, be discovered. This, however, will not always answer.

§ 5. IF it do not, let the second consideration be, whether the term or phrase be any of the writer's peculiarities. If so, it comes naturally to be inquired, what is the acceptation in which he employs it in other places? If the sense cannot be precisely the same in the passage under review, perhaps, by an easy and natural metaphor, or other trope, the common acceptation may give rise to one which perfectly suits the passage in question. Recourse to the other places wherein the word or phrase occurs in the same author, is of considerable use, though the term should not be peculiar to him.

§ 6. BUT thirdly, if there should be nothing in the same writer that can enlighten the place, let

recourse be had to the parallel passages, if there be any such, in the other sacred writers. By parallel passages I mean those places, if the difficulty occur in history, wherein the same or a similar story, miracle, or event, is related; if in teaching or reasoning, those parts wherein the same doctrine or argument is treated, or the same parable propounded; and if in moral lessons, those wherein the same class of duties is recommended. Or, if the difficulty be found in a quotation from the Old Testament, let the parallel passage in the book referred to, both in the original Hebrew, and in the Greek version, be consulted.

§ 7. BUT, if in these there be found nothing that can throw light on the expression, of which we are in doubt; the fourth recourse is to all the places wherein the word or phrase occurs in the New Testament, and in the Septuagint version of the Old, adding to these the consideration of the import of the Hebrew or Chaldaic word whose place it occupies, and the extent of signification, of which, in different occurrences, such Hebrew or Chaldaic term is susceptible.

§ 8. PERHAPS the term in question is one of those which very rarely occur in the New Testament, or those called *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*, only once read in Scripture, and not found at all in the translation of the Seventy. Several such words there are. There is then, a necessity, in the fifth place,

for recurring to the ordinary acceptation of the term in classical authors. This is one of those cases wherein the interpretation given by the earliest Greek fathers deserves particular notice. In this verdict, however, I limit myself to those comments wherein they give a literal exposition of the sacred text, and do not run, as is but too customary with them, into vision and allegory. There are so many advantages which people have, for discovering the import of a term or phrase in their mother-tongue, unusual perhaps in writing, but current in conversation, above those who study a dead language, solely by means of the books extant in it, that no reasonable person can question that some deference is, in such cases, due to their authority.

You will observe that, in regard to the words or phrases, whereof an illustration may be had from other parts of sacred writ, whether of the Old, or of the New, Testament; I should not think it necessary to recur directly to those primitive, any more than to our modern, expounders. My reason is, as the word or phrase may not improbably be affected by the idiom of the synagogue, the Jewish literature will be of more importance than the Grecian, for throwing light upon the passage. Now this is a kind of learning with which the Greek fathers were very little acquainted. Whereas, on the other hand, if the term in question rarely, or but once occur in the New Testament, and never in the version of the Old, there is little ground to imagine that it is affected by the idiom of the synagogue, but the greatest

reason to suppose that it is adopted, by the sacred penmen, in the common acceptance.

I think it necessary to add here another limitation to the reference intended to the ancient Greek expositors. If the doubtful passage have been produced in support of a side, in any of the famous controversies by which the Christian church has been divided; no regard is due to the authority, whatever may be due to the arguments, of any writer, who lived at, or soon after, the time when the controversy was agitated. If you know the side he took in the dispute, you are sure beforehand of the explanation he will give of the words in question. Nothing blinds the understanding more effectually than the spirit of party, and no kind of party-spirit more than bigotry under the assumed character of religious zeal.

§ 9. WITH respect to the use to be made of the Fathers, for assisting us to understand the Scriptures, there are two extremes, to one or other of which, the much greater part of Christians show a propensity. One is, an implicit deference to their judgment, in every point on which they have given an opinion; the other is, no regard at all to any thing advanced by them. To the first extreme the more moderate Romanists, and those Protestants who favour pompous ceremonies, and an aristocratical hierarchy, are most inclined; and to the second, those Protestants, on the contrary, who prefer simplicity of worship, and the democratical form in church

government. But these observations admit many exceptions. As to the Papists, in the worst sense of the word, those who are for supporting even the most exorbitant of the papal claims, the manifest tendency whereof is to establish an ecclesiastical despotism, the aim of their doctrine, in spite of the canons, has long been to lessen, as much as possible, our reverence of the Fathers. What was said by Friar Theatin an Italian, in a public disputation with some French divines, at Paris, in presence of the Pope's nuncio and many prelates, may be justly considered as spoken in the spirit, and expressive of the sentiments, of the whole party. When his antagonist Baron, a Dominican, urged the testimonies of several Fathers, in direct opposition to the doctrine maintained by the Italian, the latter did not recur to the chimerical distinctions of the Sorbonists, but making light of that long train of authorities, replied contemptuously, "As to what concerns the authority of the Fathers, I have only to say with the church, *Omnes sancti patres orate pro nobis ;*" an answer which, at the same time that it greatly scandalized the Galican doctors, was highly approved by the Nuncio, well knowing that it would be very much relished at Rome. So similar on this head are the sentiments of the most opposite sects. Nor is this the only instance wherein the extremes approach nearer to each other, than the middle does to either. I may add that an unbounded respect for the Fathers was, till the commencement of the sixteenth century, the prevalent sentiment in Christendom. Since

that time, their authority has declined apace, and is, at present, in many places, totally annihilated.

I own that, in my opinion, they of former generations were in one extreme, and we of the present are in another. The Fathers are not entitled to our adoration, neither do they merit our contempt. If some of them were weak and credulous, others of them were both learned and judicious. In what depends purely on reason and argument, we ought to treat them with the same impartiality we do the moderns, carefully weighing what is said, not who says it. In what depends on testimony, they are, in every case wherein no particular passion can be suspected to have swayed them, to be preferred before modern interpreters or annotators. I say not this to insinuate that we can rely more on their integrity, but to signify that many points were with them a subject of testimony, which, with modern critics, are matter merely of conjecture, or at most, of abstruse and critical discussion. It is only from ancient authors, that those ancient usages, in other things, as well as in language, can be discovered by us, which to them stood on the footing of matters of fact, whereof they could not be ignorant. Language, as has been often observed, is founded in use; and ancient use, like all other ancient facts, can be conveyed to us only by written testimony. Besides, the facts regarding the import of words (when controversy is out of the question) do not, like other facts, give scope to the passions to operate; and if misrepresented, they expose either the ignorance, or the bad faith, of the author,

to his cotemporaries. I do not say, therefore, that we ought to confide in the verdict of the Fathers as judges, but that we ought to give them an impartial hearing as, in many cases, the only competent witnesses. And every body must be sensible that the direct testimony of a plain man, in a matter which comes within the sphere of his knowledge, is more to be regarded, than the subtle conjectures of an able scholar who does not speak from knowledge, but gives the conclusions he has drawn from his own precarious reasonings, or from those of others.

§ 10. AND, even as to what is advanced not on knowledge, but on opinion, I do not think that the moderns are, in general, entitled to the preference. On controverted articles of faith, both ought to be consulted with caution, as persons who may reasonably be thought prejudiced, in favour of the tenets of their party. If, in this respect, there be a difference, it is entirely in favour of the ancients. An increase of years has brought to the church an increase of controversies. Disputes have multiplied, and been dogmatically decided. The consequence whereof is, that religion was not near so much moulded into the systematic form, for many centuries, as it is in these latter ages. Every point was not, in ancient times, so minutely discussed, and every thing, even to the phraseology, settled, in the several sects, with so much hypercritical, and metaphysical, not to say sophistical subtlety, as at present. They were, therefore, if not entirely free, much less entangled

with decisions merely human, than more recent commentators; too many of whom seem to have had it for their principal object, to bring the language of Scripture to as close a conformity, as possible, to their own standard, and make it speak the dialect of their sect. So much for the preference I give to the ancient, particularly to the Greek, expounders of Scripture, when they confine themselves to the grammatical sense; and so much for the regard to which I think the early Christian writers justly entitled.

§ 11. To the aid we may have from them, I add that of the ancient versions, and, last of all, that of modern scholiasts, annotators, and translators. In the choice of these we ought to be more influenced, by the acknowledged learning, discernment, and candour of the person, than by the religious denomination to which he belonged, or the side which, on contested articles, he most favoured. So far from limiting ourselves to those of one sect, or of one set of tenets, it is only by the free use of the criticisms and arguments of opposite sides, as urged by themselves, that undue prepossessions are best cured, or even prevented. We have heard of poisons which serve as antidotes against other poisons of opposite quality. It will be no inconvenient consequence of the use of interpreters addicted to adverse parties, if their excesses serve mutually to correct one another.

§ 12. BUT I am aware that some will be astonished that, among the assistances enumerated for

interpreting the Scriptures, I have made no mention of two helps much celebrated by writers of almost all denominations. These are *the analogy of the faith*, and *the etymology of the words*. It will no doubt be proper now to inquire impartially, what aid, in the interpretation of dark and doubtful passages, may reasonably be sought for, and expected, from these.

§ 13. FIRST, of the analogy of the faith: As far as I can collect, from the import of the terms, what is meant by proposing this as a rule of interpretation, in every dubious case; it should be, that when a passage appears ambiguous, or is susceptible of different interpretations, that interpretation is always to be adopted which is most conformable to the whole scheme of religion, in respect both of doctrines and of precepts, delivered in the sacred oracles. Now there can be no question that, if the inquirer be previously in the certain knowledge of that whole scheme, this rule is excellent, and, in a great measure, supersedes the necessity of any other. But, let me ask him, or rather, let him ask himself, ere he proceed, this simple question, What is the reason, the principal reason, at least, for which the study of Scripture is so indispensable a duty? It is precisely, all consistent Protestants will answer, that thence we may discover what the whole scheme of religion is. Are we then to begin our examination with taking it for granted that, without any inquiry, we are perfectly acquainted with this scheme already?

Is not this going to Scripture, not in order to learn the truths it contains, but in order to find something that may be made to ratify our own opinions ?

If no more were meant by making the analogy of the faith the rule of interpreting, than that, where an expression is either dark or equivocal, an interpretation were not to be adopted, which would contradict the sentiments of the writer, manifestly declared in other passages perfectly clear and unequivocal ; this is no more than what candour would allow in interpreting any profane author, who seems to have enjoyed the exercise of his reason ; nay, though the rule were extended to what should be found clearly contained in any other sacred writer, it would be but of little significance as an help in the explanation of the holy oracles. For, in the phrase *the analogy of the faith*, when proposed, in this manner, as a canon to direct us in the interpretation of Scripture ; it is only the uncontroverted truths, about which there has never arisen any doubt in the church, that ought to be comprehended.

‘ But why,’ say you, ‘ should we confine the meaning to the uncontroverted truths ?’ Attend a little, and you must perceive that what I have now advanced, is almost self-evident. When I recur to holy writ, my view is, or ought to be, that I may know what it teaches ; more especially that, as its doctrine is so variously represented by different sects, I may thence discover, amid such a multiplicity of jarring sentiments, where the truth lies. My purpose manifestly is, by the Scripture,

to judge concerning all such controverted sentiments, and not, by a particular set of controverted sentiments, previously, and therefore inconsiderately, adopted, to determine concerning the sense of Scripture. This would not be judging the parties by the law, but resolving to judge of the import of the law by the interpretation that shall be given by one of the parties, whom we have contracted a strong inclination to favour. Surely such a conduct in a civil judge would be universally pronounced incompatible with every principle of reason and justice. And is not at least as great a deference due from the devout Christian to the divine oracles, as is due from the secular judge to the law of his country ?

§ 14. IN vain do we search the Scriptures for their testimony concerning Christ, if, independently of these Scriptures, we have received a testimony from another quarter, and are determined to admit nothing, as the testimony of Scripture, which will not perfectly quadrate with that formerly received. This was the very source of the blindness of the Jews in our Saviour's time. They searched the Scriptures as much as we do ; but, in the disposition they were in, they would never have discovered what that sacred volume testifies of Christ². Why ? Because their great rule of interpretation was *the analogy of the faith* ; or, in other words, the system of

² See John, v. 39, 40. in this Translation, with the note upon it.

the Pharisean scribes, the doctrine then in vogue, and in the profound veneration of which they had been educated. This is that veil by which the understandings of that people were darkened, even in reading the law ; of which the Apostle observed, that it remained unremoved in his day, and of which we ourselves have occasion to observe, that it remains unremoved in ours.

And is it not precisely in the same way that the phrase is used by every sect of Christians, for the particular system or digest of tenets for which they themselves have the greatest reverence ? The Latin church, and even the Greek, are explicit in their declarations on this article. With each *the analogy of the faith* is their own system alone. And that different parties of Protestants, though more reserved in their manner of speaking, aim at the same thing, is undeniable : the same, I mean, considered relatively to the speakers ; for absolutely considered, every party means a different thing. When a Lutheran tells you, “ You are to put no interpretation on “ any portion of Scripture, but what perfectly “ coincides with *the analogy of the faith* ;” sift him ever so little on the import of this phrase, and you shall find that, if he mean any thing, it is, that you are to admit no exposition that will not exactly tally with the system of his great founder Luther. Nor is he singular in this. A Calvinist has the same prepossession in favour of the scheme of Calvin, and an Arminian of that of Arminius. Yet they will all tell you with one voice, that their respective doctrines are to be tried

by Scripture, and by Scripture alone. *To the law and to the testimony*, is the common cry; only every one of them, the better to secure the decision on the side he has espoused, would have you previously resolve, to put no sense whatever on the law and the testimony, but what his favourite doctor will admit. Thus they run on in a shuffling circular sort of argument, which, though they studiously avoid exposing it, is, when dragged into the open light, neither more nor less than this: "You are to try our doctrine by the Scripture only. But then you are to be very careful that you explain the Scripture solely by our doctrine." A wonderful plan of trial, which begins with giving judgment, and ends with examining the proof, wherein the whole skill and ingenuity of the judges are to be exerted in wresting the evidence so as to give it the appearance of supporting the sentence pronounced beforehand.

'But,' say some, 'is not this mode of interpretation warranted by apostolical authority? Does not Paul³, in speaking of the exercise of the spiritual gifts, enjoin the prophets to prophesy, *κατα την αναλογιαν της πισεως*, according to the proportion of faith, as our translators render it, but as some critics explain it, according to the analogy of the faith?' Though this exposition has been admitted into some versions⁴ and adopted

³ Rom. xii. 6.

⁴ Port Royal and Saci, though translating from the Vulgate, which says, *secundum rationem fidei*, have rendered the clause *selon l'analogie et la regle de la foi*.

by Hammond and other commentators, and may be called literal, it is suited neither to the ordinary meaning of the words, nor to the tenor of the context. The word *αναλογια* strictly denotes proportion, measure, rate, but by no means that complex notion conveyed in the aforesaid phrase by the term *analogy*, which has been well observed by Whitby, to be particularly unsuitable in this place, where the Apostle treats of those who speak by inspiration, not of those who explain what has been thus spoken by others. The context manifestly leads us to understand *αναλογια πισεως*, v. 6. as equivalent to *μετρον πισεως*, v. 3. And for the better understanding of this phrase, *the measure of faith*, it may be proper to observe, 1st, that a strong conviction of any tenet, from whatever cause it arises, is in Scripture sometimes termed *faith*. Thus, in the same Epistle⁵, the Apostle says, *Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God*. The scope of his reasoning shows that nothing is there meant by *faith*, but a conviction of the truth, in regard to the article of which he had been treating, namely, the equality of days and meats, in point of sanctity, under the gospel dispensation. The same is evidently the meaning of the word, v. 23. *Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin*; where, without regard to the morality of an action, abstractly considered; that is concluded to be sin which is done by one who doubts of its lawfulness; 2dly, as to spiritual gifts, prophecy and

⁵ Rom. xiv. 22.

inspiration in particular, they appear to have been accompanied with such a faith or conviction that they came from the Spirit, as left no room for hesitation. And indeed it is easy to perceive, that something of this kind was absolutely necessary, to enable the inspired person to distinguish what proceeded from the Spirit of God, from what was the creature of his own imagination. It was observed before ⁶, that the prophets of God were not acted upon like machines, in delivering their predictions, as the diviners were supposed to be among the heathen, but had then, as at other times, the free use of their faculties both of body and mind. This caution is therefore with great propriety given them by the Apostle, to induce them to be attentive, in prophesying, not to exceed the precise measure allowed them, (for different measures of the same gift were committed to different persons,) and not to mingle aught of their own, with the things of God's Spirit. This distinction, he tells them, they have it in their power to make, by means of that lively faith with which the divine illumination is accompanied. Though a sense somewhat different has been given to the words, by some ancient Greek expositors, none of them, as far as I remember, seems to have formed a conception of that sense which, as was observed above, has been given by some moderns.

So much for what is commonly understood by *the analogy of the faith*, so unanimously recom-

⁶ Diss. I. Part II. § 3.

mended as a rule of interpretation, but so discordantly applied; and so much for the regard that is due to it.

§ 15. ANOTHER ordinary method of explaining is, by entering, on every occasion, into a minute and nice examination of the etymology of the principal words employed in the sentence. This, though generally carried to excess, neither proceeds from the like partial prepossessions as the former, nor is so hazardous in its consequences. There are cases wherein no reasonable person can doubt, that the signification of a word may be fully ascertained from the knowledge we have of the meaning of the etymon: for instance, in verbal nouns expressing the action signified by the verb, as *κριμα judgment*, from *κρινειν to judge*, or the actor, as *κριτης a judge*, from the same root; in concretes from abstracts, as *αληθινος true*, from *αληθεια truth*; or conversely, abstracts from concretes, as *δικαιοσυνη justice*, from *δικαιος just*. In compositions also analogically formed, the sense of the compound term may often be with certainty known, by the import of the simple terms of which it is composed. Thus no man will hesitate a moment to pronounce from etymology, that *φιληδονος* must mean *a lover of pleasure*, and *φιλοθεος* *a lover of God*; though these words occur but once in the New Testament, and never in the Greek version of the Old. In matters so obvious, the bare knowledge of the rudiments of the language renders the mention of any rules, save those of grammar, unnecessary,

almost as much as for determining the import of the future tense of a verb from that of the present, or the signification of the passive voice from that of the active. There are instances, however, wherein the verb in the passive form undergoes an additional change of meaning, beside what the analogy of the language requires.

§ 16. BUT, there are a great many cases wherein, if I may be allowed the expression, the pedigree of the derivative, or of the compound, cannot be deduced with equal clearness; and there are many cases wherein, though its descent may be clearly traced, we should err egregiously, if we were to fix its meaning from that of the primitive or root. As to the first, that we should not hastily decide concerning the import of an obscure or unusual term, from that of another better known, but of whose relation to the former we are uncertain, is indeed manifest. But even often, where the connection is unquestionable, the sense of the one does not ascertain the signification of the other. It will not be improper to give a few illustrations of this doctrine, as I know nothing in which modern critics are more frequently misled, than in their reasonings from etymology. I shall exemplify this remark first in simple words, and afterwards in compound.

§ 17. THE Greek word *τραγικος*, from *τραγος* a goat; if it occurred very seldom in Greek authors, and if in the few places where it occurred, the

words in connection did not suffice for ascertaining the sense, and if the custom which gave rise to the common acceptance of that term had never been related by any ancient writer, nobody, by the aid of etymology, could have imagined the meaning to be that which we know certainly that it is. As much may be said of the word *κωμικος*, from *κωμη* a village. By neither should we have been led to think of poetry or any of its species. To the Greek word *κωμικος* the Latin *paganus* answers exactly, in being similarly derived from a primitive of the same signification. But it is very far from corresponding in sense. Nor does it, in the use which soon became universal among Christians, correspond better with its etymon *paganus*. When Christianity became very general throughout the empire, as all the churches were in the cities and great towns, where the bishops had their residence, the Christians found a convenience in living near their place of worship, which made them mostly resort to the cities or their suburbs. Those who were attached to the ancient idolatry, not having the same motive for preferring the towns, and probably liking better, when Christianity came to have the ascendant, to associate with one another, lived generally in the villages. Hence *villager* and *idolater* became synonymous. This sense of the Latin *paganus* has passed into modern tongues. The Italians say *pagano*, the French *payen*, and the English *pagan*, to denote the same character. The English word *villain*, in low Latin *villanus*, a farmer, a villager, though nearly coinciding in etymology,

has come gradually by use to signify a worthless unprincipled man. Thus the three words *καμικος* in Greek, *paganus* in Latin, and *villain* in English, though evidently so conformable in etymology, that they all ought to denote the same thing, namely *villager*; have, for many ages, both lost that signification, and acquired others in which they do not in the least resemble one another. If the use in these languages should ever come to be very little known, and the history of the nations nearly lost, we may form a guess at the absurdities in explaining those terms into which men would be misled by etymology. קדשה *kedeshah*, in Hebrew signifies *a harlot*, a word manifestly sprung, according to the invariable rules of that language, from קדש *kadash*, *to sanctify*. What could give rise to so strange a deviation from the primitive meaning, it is perhaps now impossible to discover.

In process of time, words in every tongue vary from their original import, in consequence of the gradual influence of incidental causes, and the changes in manners and sentiments which they occasion. Hence the word זרה among the Hebrews, which denoted no more at first than a female stranger, came at last to signify a common prostitute; and is almost always used in this sense by Solomon in the Book of Proverbs. The origin of this application may indeed be easily traced from their laws. The women of that occupation among them were all foreigners, no daughter of Israel being permitted to follow so infamous a profession. It is an observation

of Cicero, if I remember right, that the word *hostis* with them anciently meant *foreigner*, which, having been given at first, through delicacy, as a milder name for people with whom they were at war, became, through long-continued use, the proper appellation for *enemy*. By the like gradation doubtless amongst us, the word *knave*, from denoting servant, has degenerated into the sign of a character distinguished more for turpitude of manners, than for meanness of condition. It would not be easy to divine how the word *beholden*, (if not a corruption of the Dutch *gehouden*) the passive participle of the verb *to behold*, came, from signifying *seen* or *perceived*, to denote *indebted*. Innumerable examples of this kind might be mentioned.

§ 18. BUT, from simple words to proceed, as I proposed, to compounds ; were we to lay it down as a principle, that the combined meanings of the component parts will always give us the sense of the compound, we should conclude that the Greek word *πανουργος*, is equivalent to the English poetic word *omnific*, to which it exactly corresponds in etymology ; yet nothing can be more different in signification. The former is always adopted in a bad, the latter in a good sense. Hardly any rule in the composition of Greek words holds more uniformly than that the adverb *ευ* gives the addition of a good quality to the word with which it is joined ; yet the term *ευηθης* which, if any faith were due to etymology, should mean a virtuous and wor-

thy man, denotes generally a *simpleton* or *fool*. The Greek word *αυταρχεια* exactly corresponds, in respect of the signification of its component parts, to the English word *self-sufficiency* : yet the former has a good meaning, and denotes *contentment* ; the latter, except when applied to the Deity, has invariably a bad meaning, and signifies *arrogance*. Sometimes the sense of one of the words in composition is totally lost, the compound term being applied in a manner which excludes it. Thus the word *οικοδομεω* ought to signify *to build a house*, but it is not only construed with *ταφος* a *sepulchre* (which by metaphor may indeed be called a house, being the receptacle of the dead,) but with *θυσιασηριον* *altar*, *χαρακωσις* *bulwark*, and several other terms which, in no sense, proper or figurative, can be denominated *houses*. Such anomalies, both in derivation and in composition, are to be found in all tongues, insomuch that often etymology points to one meaning, and use to another. Were we to mind the indication of the former, the English word *always* ought to be rendered into Latin *omnimodo* and not *semper* ; our verb *to vouchsafe* should denote *to give one a protection*, or *to insure one's safety*, and not *to deign* or *condescend*. The inseparable preposition *re* in English commonly denotes *again*, but *to reprove* is not *to prove again*, *to recommend* is not *to commend again*, nor does *to remark* mean *to mark again*. As little can these be explained by the aid of the adverb *back*, like the verbs *to recall* and *to return*.

§ 19. IN the above examples I have confined myself to terms whose meaning, though an exception from the rules of analogy, is incontrovertible; my principal object being to evince, to the satisfaction of every intelligent reader, that the sense of words is often totally different from that to which the etymology points, and that, consequently, in all the cases wherein use cannot be discovered, and wherein the context does not necessarily fix the meaning, the conviction which arises from etymology alone, is considerably inferior to that which arises either from known use, or from the words immediately connected. But, before I dismiss this topic, I shall offer some criticisms on a few passages of the New Testament which may appear, on a superficial view, more controvertible, in order to show with how much caution we ought to proceed in rendering a compound word in one language, by one in another similarly compounded; and that even, though the original term be not, like those above specified, an exception, in respect of meaning, from the common rules of analogy.

The word *διψυχος*, used by the Apostle James, compounded of *δις*, signifying in composition *double* or *twice*, and *ψυχη*, *soul*, *mind*, *spirit*, could not, one would at first imagine, be more properly or literally rendered, than by the similar English compound *double-minded*. But this, though in some sense, it may be called a literal version, is a mistranslation of the word, inasmuch as it conveys a sense entirely different. Yet the meaning of the

original term is analogical : only there are different ways wherein the mind or soul may be charged with duplicity. One is, when it sometimes leans to one opinion, sometimes to the contrary ; another is, when it secretly harbours passions and opinions the reverse of those which it openly professes. No two meanings can be more different ; the first is certainly the import of the Greek word, the second of the English, which is justly explained by Johnson, *deceitful, insidious*. To recur to the passage itself⁷ ; *Ανηδυνυχος ακαταστατος εν πασαις ταις ὁδοις αυτη*, in the common translation, *A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways* : first, the sentiment itself may suggest a doubt of the justness of the version. There appears no immediate connection between deceitfulness and inconstancy. The deceitful are often but too stable in a bad course. The doubleness expressed in the English word does not imply sudden changes of any kind ; but solely, that the real motives of conduct and the outward professions disagree ; or that the person intends one thing, whilst he professes another. Now who sees not that, in respect of both the intention and the profession, he may be very steady ? Fickleness is not remarkably an attendant on hypocrisy. When I examine the context, I find nothing there that relates to sincerity or the conformity that ought to subsist between a man's words and his thoughts ; but I am led directly by

⁷ James, i. 8.

it to think of constancy in right principles, as the apostle had been, in the preceding words, urging the necessity of unshaken faith. This verse, if *διψυχος* be understood to mean unsteady in the belief of the truth, perfectly coincides with, and supports, the Apostle's argument; implying that inconstancy in principles produces inconstancy in the whole conduct, than which no sentiment can be clearer.

To recur, however, to some of the other rules of criticising above mentioned (not as necessary, in the present instance, but for the sake of illustration,) and first to Scriptural usage; I find, on inquiry, that there is only one other passage in the New Testament wherein the word occurs. It is in the same Epistle, but the expression there is too general to ascertain the import of the term in question. As the word is not to be found in the Septuagint, nor even in the Apocrypha, there is reason to believe that it is not affected by the idiom of the synagogue. I therefore apply to common use, and find that the word uniformly denotes *doubtful, fluctuating* in respect of one's judgment. All its conjugates in like manner support this meaning; *διψυχια* is *doubt* or *hesitancy*, *διψυχεω* to *doubt, to hesitate*. If we apply to the ancient Greek expositors, they all interpret it in the same way. And as this is none of the passages whereon any of their theological controversies were founded, we can give them the greater credit. I shall only transcribe the explanation

given by Ecumenius⁸, which is to this effect: “*Διψυχος ανηρ* is a man of unsettled and fluctuating sentiments, too solicitous about the present to attain the future, too anxious about the future to secure the present, who driven hither and thither in his judgment of things, is perpetually shifting the object, who this moment would sacrifice all for eternity, and the next would renounce any thing for this transient life.” The sense of the Apostle’s expression may be therefore justly given in these words: *A man unsteady in his opinions, is in all his actions inconstant.*

§ 20. To the above example I shall add a few of the most common of all kinds of composition, a preposition and a verb in familiar use. My intention is chiefly to show, that a deviation in interpreting, small to appearance, even such as is apt to be overlooked by a reader deceived by the correspondence of the themes, is often sufficient to pervert the sense, either by rendering the expression totally unmeaning, or by giving it a wrong meaning. The verb *δραω*, *to see*, is common; *προ* in composition generally answers to the English inseparable preposition *fore*. The verb, therefore, *προοραω*, or, in the middle voice *προοραομαι*, should mean analogically, one would imagine, *I foresee*. It is accordingly in one

⁸ *Διψυχον ανδρα, τον ανεπειειστον, τον αβτηρικτον λεγει, τον μητε προς τα μελλοντα παγιως, μητε προς τα παροντα ασφαλως ηδραβμενον, αλλα τηδε κἀκεισε αγομενον και περιφερομενον, και ποτε μεν των μελλοντων, ποτε δε των παροντων αντεχομενον.*

place⁹ so rendered, *I foresaw the Lord always before my face*, in Greek, *προωρωμην τον Κυριον ενωπιον μου δια παντος*. The words are a quotation from the Psalms¹⁰, and are literally copied from the Septuagint.

It will naturally occur to an attentive English reader, to inquire, What is the meaning of the word *foresaw* in this passage? Foresight has a reference to the future; whereas the Psalmist is speaking of things as present: for, though it is true that the words relate to the Messiah, who was many centuries posterior to David, they are not announced in the form of a prediction. David, in speaking, personates the Messiah, of whom he was an eminent type, and ascribes as to himself what, in the sublimest sense, was applicable only to that illustrious descendant. It is as it were Christ who speaks. The Lord he represents as always before him, not as *to be* in some future period before him, adding *he is*, not *he will be*, on my right hand. In regard to the compound verb, it occurs only in one other passage of the New Testament, to be considered afterwards, and in no place of the Septuagint, except that above quoted. But, on examining more closely the import of the simple words, we discover that the Greek preposition may relate to place as well as to time, and that it is often merely what grammarians called *intensive*: that is, it does not alter the sense of the simple verb to which it is prefixed, it only renders the

⁹ Acts, ii. 25.

¹⁰ xvi. 8.

expression more emphatical. Thus the verb *προοραω* is as literally rendered *prospicio* as *prævideo*, and has been, in this passage, more fitly rendered so by Beza. It may be objected that this explanation produces a pleonasm in the sentence, as it is immediately added, *ενωπιον μου*, *before me*. But such pleonasms are not uncommon in Scripture. Thus ¹¹ *Το πνευμα υπερεντυγγανει υπερ ημων*. ¹² *Οσις ωκοδομηδε την οικιαν αυτη*. ¹³ *Φωνην ηκασα κιθαρων και κιθαραιζοντων εν ται σκιθαραις αυτων*. The last four words in this verse are plainly implied in the participle. The phrase which occurs oftener than once, *υποποδιον των πωδων αυτη*, is chargeable with the like redundancy. Add to all this, that the Hebrew word here translated *προοραω* by the Seventy, never signifies *to foresee*, but *to place*, *to set*. In this passage, being applied to the mind, it denotes the Psalmist's, or rather the Messiah's fixed attention on God as always with him.

The other passage in which this verb occurs is also in the Acts ¹⁴ *Ησαν προεωρακοτες Τροφιμον τον Εφεσιον εν τη πολει συν αυτω*. Here the connection, without other resource, shows sufficiently that the simple verb *οραω* means literally *to see*, and the preposition *προ* *before*, in respect of time, not of place, and yet that *προοραω* does not imply *to foresee*, but *to see before*. The difference lies here. The former is to see or perceive an event before it happen, the latter denotes only to see

¹¹ Rom. viii. 26.

¹² Matth. vii. 24. 26.

¹³ Rev. xiv. 2.

¹⁴ xxi. 29.

either person or thing before the present time, which alone can be the sense of this passage, and which is therefore rightly rendered by our translators, “*They had seen before with him, in the city, Trophimus an Ephesian.*” To have said, “*They had foreseen with him,*” would have totally marred the sense. But our translators have not always been equally attentive.

§ 21. I SHALL add an example, not unlike the former, in the verb *προγνωσκω*, though the difficulty, with regard to it, arises as much from the signification of the simple verb, as from that of the preposition. Paul says ¹⁵, *Ουκ απωσατο ο Θεος τον λαον αυτη ον προεγνω*, which our translators render, *God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew.* The last clause in this version conveys to my mind no meaning whatever. To *foreknow* always signifies to know some event before it happen; but no event is here mentioned, so that we are at a loss to discover the object of the foreknowledge mentioned. Is it only the existence of the people? Even this is not explicitly said; but if this were the writer’s intention, we should still be at a loss for the sense. There is nothing in this circumstance, which distinguishes God’s people from any other people, for the existence of all were equally foreknown by him: whereas here something peculiar is plainly intended, which is suggested as a reason to prevent our thinking that God would ever totally cast them away. Though

¹⁵ Rom. xi. 2

nothing, to appearance, can answer more exactly than the English *foreknew*, does to the Greek *προεγνων*, it, in reality, labours under a double defect. The first is the same which was observed in the preceding paragraph, in rendering the preposition; for there is the same difference between *knowing before* and *foreknowing*, that there is between *seeing before* and *foreseeing*. Our translators have, on some occasions, shown themselves sensible of the difference. Accordingly they render *προγνωσκοντες με ανωθεν*¹⁶, *which knew me from the beginning*, not *foreknew me*. The example above quoted from the twenty-first chapter of the Acts, is a similar instance.

The prepositions in the two languages, though nearly, are not perfectly, correspondent, especially in composition. With us the inseparable preposition *fore*, prefixed to *know*, *see*, *tell*, and *show*, always relates to some event, which is *known*, *seen*, *told*, and *shown* before it happen: whereas the Greek preposition *προ* does not necessarily relate to an event, and signifies no more than *before this time*. The difference in these idioms may be thus illustrated. A friend introducing a person with whom he supposes me unacquainted, says, *This is such a man*. I make answer, *I knew him before*. I should speak nonsense, if I said, *I foreknew him*. Yet in Greek I might say properly, *προεγνων*.

Another instance wherein our interpreters have shown an attention to this distinction, we have in

¹⁶ Acts, xxvi. 5.

the Second Epistle to the Corinthians¹⁷, where they translate the word *προειρηκα* very properly, *I have said before*. Every reader of discernment must perceive that it would have been absurd to render it in that place, *I have foretold*.

But to return to the passage under review in the Epistle to the Romans : it was observed, that the common version of the word *προεγνω*, in that passage, labours under a double defect. It is not, in my judgment, barely in translating the preposition that the error lies, but also in the sense assigned to the verb compounded with it. That God knew Israel before, in the ordinary meaning of the word *knowing*, could never have been suggested as a reason to hinder us from thinking that he would ever cast them off: for, from the beginning, all nations and all things are alike known to God. But the verb *γνωσκαω*, in Hellenistic use, has all the latitude of signification which the verb *יָדַע* *jadang* has, being that whereby the Seventy commonly render the Hebrew word. Now the Hebrew word means not only to *know*, in the common acceptation, but to *acknowledge* and to *approve*. Nothing is more common in Scripture than this use. “The Lord *knoweth*, *γνωσκει*, the way of the righteous¹⁸,” that is, *approveth*. “Then I will profess unto them, I never *knew* you,” *εγνωσων*, *acknowledged* you for mine¹⁹. “If any man love God, the same is known of him²⁰,” *εγνωσται*,

¹⁷ vii. 3.¹⁸ Psalm i. 6.¹⁹ Matth. vii. 23.²⁰ 1 Cor. viii. 3.

acknowledged. If, therefore, in the passage under examination, we understand in this way the verb *γινωσκω*, adding the import of the preposition *προ*, *before*, *formerly*, *heretofore*, the meaning is both clear and pertinent: "God hath not cast off his people whom heretofore he acknowledged."

I shall just add a sense of the verb *προγινωσκω* as used by the Apostle Peter²¹, different from both the former. The verb *γινωσκω* in classical use often denotes *to decree*, *to ordain*, *to give sentence* as a judge, and therefore *προγινωσκω*, *to foreordain*, &c. It is in this sense only we can understand *Προεγνωσμενυ προ καταβολης κοσμου*, which our interpreters have rightly rendered "*foreordained*, before the foundation of the world." But they have not so well translated the verbal noun *προγνωσις* in the second verse of the chapter, *foreknowledge*, which renders the expression, indefinite and obscure, not to say, improper. It ought, for the same reason, to have been *predetermination*. The same word, in the same signification, occurs in the Acts²², where it is also improperly rendered *foreknowledge*.

§ 22. It may be thought that, in the composition of substantives, or of an adjective and a substantive, in familiar use, there is hardly a possibility of error, the import of both the simple words being essential to the compound. But this is not

²¹ 1 Peter, i. 20.

²² Acts, ii. 23.

without exception, as *βωμολοχος*, *συκοφαντης*, *χειροτονια*, and many others, evince. It is indeed very probable, that the import of such terms originally was, what the etymology indicates. But, in their application, such variations are insensibly introduced by custom, as sometimes fix them, at last, in a meaning very different from the primary sense, or that to which the component parts would lead us.

I shall bring for an example a term about which translators have been very little divided. It is the word *σκληροκαρδια*, always rendered in the common version, *hardness of heart*. Nothing can be more literal, or to appearance, more just. *Σκληροκαρδια* is compounded of *σκληρος* *hard*, and *καρδια* *heart*. Nor can it be denied that these English words, taken severally, are, in almost every case, expressive of the full sense of the Greek words, also taken severally. Yet there is reason to suspect that the Greek compound does not answer to the meaning constantly affixed by us to *hardness of heart*, or, in one word, *hard-heartedness*. Let us recur to examples. In Matthew²³ we read thus; “Moses, because of the *hardness of your hearts*, *προς την σκληροκαρδιαν υμων*, suffered you to put away your wives.” Now these terms *hardness of heart* with us always denote cruelty, inhumanity, barbarity. It does not appear that this is our Lord’s meaning in this passage. And, though the passage might be so paraphrased, as would give a plausibility to this

²³ Matth. xix. 8.

interpretation, I do not recollect that this vice of cruelty, as a national vice, was ever imputed to them by Moses; though he often charges them with incredulity, obstinacy, and rebellion. As there is nothing, however, in the context, that can be called decisive, I recur to the other passages in the New Testament wherein the word is found. These are but two, and both of them in Mark's Gospel. One of them is,²⁴ where the same occurrence is recorded as in the passage of Matthew above referred to. In these two parallel places there is so little variation in the words, that the doubt as to the meaning of this term must equally affect them both. The other passage is²⁵, in the account given of our Lord's appearance to his disciples after his resurrection. "Afterwards: "he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at "meat, and upbraided them with *their unbelief*, "and *hardness of heart*, *την απιστιαν αυτων και* " *σκληροκαρδιαν*, because they believed not them "which had seen him after he was risen." Nothing can be clearer than that the word here has no relation to *inhumanity*; as this great event gave no handle for displaying either this vice or the contrary virtue. Some commentators, after Grotius, render it here *incredulity*, making our Saviour express the same fault by both words *απιστια* and *σκληροκαρδια*. I do not say that the use of such synonymas is without example in Scripture; though I would not recur to them where another interpretation were equally natural, and even more

²⁴ Mark, x. 5.²⁵ xvi. 14.

probable. I think therefore, that by the first of these terms the effect is meant, and by the second the cause ; that is, their stiff and untractable temper, their indocility or perverseness. Now this is a fault with which the Jews are frequently upbraided by Moses. Besides, this interpretation perfectly suits the sense of both passages. In that first quoted, as well as in this, the connection is evident. “ Moses, because of your untractable disposition, permitted you to divorce your wives;” lest, by making the marriage tie indissoluble, ye had perversely renounced marriage altogether, saying, as some of the disciples did, “ If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.” The sense *unbelief*, which Grotius puts upon it, is rather more forced in that passage than the common acceptation. Castalio renders it very properly *pervicacia*.

If, for further satisfaction, I recur to the Septuagint, I find invariably a connection with *perverseness*, never with *inhumanity*. Where we read in English²⁶, “ Circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked,” the Seventy have it, *Περιτεμεισθε την σκληροκαρδιαν υμων, και τον τραχηλον υμων ε σκληρυνειτε ετι*. Here the opposition of the members in the sentence, which, in the Oriental taste, gives the same command, first in the positive form, and then in the negative, renders the meaning indubitable. The adjective *σκληροκαρδιος* is used in the Book of Proverbs²⁷ for perverse or untractable. ‘O

²⁶ Deut. x. 16.

²⁷ xvii. 20.

σκληροκαρδιος, in Hebrew, לב שרע *ghakesh leb*, & συναντα αγαθοις; rendered justly in the Vulgate, *Qui perversi cordis est, non inveniet bonum*; in English, "He that hath a froward heart, findeth no good." There is another example of this adjective in Ezekiel²⁸, which appears to me decisive. The verse runs thus in our version: "The house of Israel will not hearken unto thee; for they will not hearken unto me, for all the house of Israel are impudent and hard-hearted;" φιλονεικοι εισι και σκληροκαρδιοι. It is plain, from the context, that nothing is advanced which can fix on them the charge of inhumanity; but every thing points to their indocile and untractable temper. In like manner, when the verb σκληρυνω is followed by την καρδιαν, the meaning is invariably either to *become*, or to *render, refractory, rebellious*, not *cruel* or *inhumane*. This is evidently the sense of it as applied to Pharaoh, whose obstinacy the severest judgments hardly could surmount. And can any person doubt that the meaning of the Psalmist, when he says²⁹, *To day if ye shall hear his voice, μη σκληρυνητε τας καρδιας υμων*, is, *be not contumacious or stiff-necked, as in the provocation?* It is impossible either to recur to the history referred to³⁰, or to the comment on the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews³¹, and not perceive this to be a full expression of the sense. *Hard-hearted*, therefore, in our language, which stands

²⁸ iii. 7.²⁹ Psal. xcv. 7, 8.³⁰ Numb. xiv.³¹ Heb. iii. & iv.

always in opposition to *tender-hearted* or *compassionate*, is not a just translation, though in some sense, it may be called a literal translation, of *σκληροκαρδιος*.

§ 23. IF we inquire a little into the figurative significations given to the simple word *καρδια* by the sacred penmen, we shall find their application of the compound to *contumacy* or *indocility*, as natural as ours is to *cruelty* and *unfeelingness*. Let it be observed then that, though the Greek word *καρδια*, when used in the proper sense for the part of the body so denominated, is equivalent to the English word *heart*; it is not always so, when used metaphorically. With us it is made, by figure, to stand, sometimes for *courage*, sometimes for *affection*, of which it is considered as the seat; but hardly ever, that I remember, for *understanding*. To denote this faculty, we sometimes speak of a good or a bad *head*; we also use the term *brain*. This, and not the *heart*, we regard as the seat of intelligence and discernment. Yet this was a frequent use of the term *heart* among the ancients, not the Hebrews only, but even the Greeks and the Romans. *Καρδια* in Greek, even in the best use, as well as *cor* in Latin, are employed to denote discernment and understanding. Hence, the word *cordatus* in Latin, for *wise, judicious, prudent*.

For the present purpose it suffices to produce a few instances from Scripture, which will put the matter beyond a doubt. For the sake of brevity,

I shall but just name the things attributed to the heart, referring to the passages in the margin; that from them every person may judge of the figurative application. First then, intelligence is ascribed to it³², also reasoning³³, likewise blindness³⁴, doubts³⁵, faith³⁶, thought³⁷, comparison³⁸, reflection³⁸; in short, all that we commonly consider as belonging to the intellectual faculty, are applied, in Scripture, to the heart, a term which, in figurative style, is used with very great latitude. In this view of the metonymy, *σκληροκαρδιος* comes naturally to signify *indocile, untractable*, of an understanding so hard, that instruction cannot penetrate it. Of similar formation is the term *thick-skulled* with us. But the sense is not entirely the same. This implies mere incapacity, that an untoward disposition.

§ 24. HERE it may not be improper to suggest a caution, for preventing mistakes, not only in the interpretation of Scripture, but in that of all ancient writers. Though a particular word, in a modern language, may exactly correspond with a certain word, in a foreign or a dead language, when both are used literally and properly; these

³² Matth. xiii. 15.

³³ Mark, ii. 6.

³⁴ iii. 5, &c. The term is *πρωῖς* *callousness*, rendered *hardness* in the common translation, but which as often means *blindness*, and is so rendered Rom. xi. 25. Eph. iv. 18. A sense here more suitable to the context.

³⁵ Mark, xi. 23.

³⁶ Rom. x. 10.

³⁷ Acts, viii. 22.

³⁸ Luke, ii. 19.

words may be very far from corresponding, when used metaphorically, or when affected by any trope whatever. Nor does this remark hold in any thing more frequently than in that sort of metonymy, so common amongst every people, whereby some parts of the body, especially of the entrails, have been substituted to denote certain powers or affections of the mind, with which they are supposed to be connected. The opinions of different nations and different ages, on this article, differ so widely from one another, that the figurative sense, in one tongue, is a very unsafe guide to the figurative sense, in another. In some instances they seem even to stand in direct opposition to each other. The *spleen* was accounted by the ancient Greeks and Romans the seat of mirth and laughter; by us moderns it is held (I suppose with equal reason,) the seat of ill humour and melancholy. When, therefore, it is evident, that the name is, in one of those ancient languages, used not properly, but tropically; what some would call a literal translation into a modern tongue, would, in fact, be a misrepresentation of the author, and a gross perversion of the sense³⁹.

³⁹ I had occasion to consider a little this subject in another work, *The Philosophy of Rhétoric*, Book III. Ch. I. Sect. II. Part I. I there took notice of a remark of Cornutus on these words of the first satire of Persius: *Sum petulanti splene cacchinno*. Which, as it is much to my present purpose, and not long, I shall here repeat. “Physici dicunt homines splene ridere, felle irasci, jecore amare, corde sapere, et pulmone

§ 25. I SHALL add but one other example, of the misinterpretation of a compound word, arising from the apparent, rather than the real import of its etymology. The word *ὁμοιοπαθης* occurs twice in the New Testament. The first time is on occasion of the miraculous cure of the lame man, by Paul and Barnabas at Lystra. When the people would have offered sacrifice to the workers of this miracle, supposing them to be two of their gods, Jupiter and Mercury; the two apostles no sooner heard of their intention, than they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out and saying (as in the common translation,) “Sirs, why do ye these things? we also are men *of like passions with you*⁴⁰,” *ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ὑμῖν*. The other occasion of the word’s occurring, is where the Apostle James said, as our translators render it, “Elias was a man *subject to like passions as we are*, *ὁμοιοπαθης ἡμῖν*, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain⁴¹.” From which passages I have heard it gravely inferred, that

“jactari.” To the same purpose, I find in a very ancient piece, called the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, supposed to be the work of a Christian of the first century, the following sentiment in the Testament of Naphtali, introduced for the sake of illustrating that God made all things good, adapting each to its proper use, *καρδιαν εἰς φρονησιν, ἡπαρ πρὸς θυμον, χολην πρὸς πικριαν, εἰς γελωτα σπληνα, νεφρους εἰς πανοργιαν*. Grab. Spicil. patrum I. Secul. T. 1. Ed. 2. p. 212. This, though differing a little from the remark made by the commentator on Persius, perfectly coincides with what regards the *heart* and the *spleen*.

⁴⁰ Acts, xiv. 15.

⁴¹ James, v. 17.

a superiority over the passions is hardly to be expected from the influence even of the most divine religion, or the most distinguishing lights of the Spirit: since sacred writ itself seems, in this respect, to put Jews, Christians, and Pagans, nay prophets, apostles, and idolatrous priests and people, all upon a level.

But this arises merely from the mistranslation of the word *ὁμοιοπαθης*, concerning which I beg leave to offer the following remarks: 1st, I remark, that it is found only twice in the New Testament, does not occur in the version of the Seventy, and but once in the Apocryphal writings, where it is applied to the earth⁴², in which there is nothing analogous to human passions, though there is some analogy to human sufferings and dissolution; and that therefore we have no reason, agreeably to an observation lately made⁴³, to consider this term as affected by the idiom of the synagogue. 2dly, If we recur to classical use, we find that it implies no more than *fellow-mortal*, and has no relation to what, in our language, is peculiarly called *passion*; and, 3dly, That with this, the etymology rightly understood, perfectly agrees. The primary signification of *παθος* in Greek, and of the unclassical term *passio* in Latin, is *suffering*; the first from *πασχειν*, the second from *pati*, to suffer. Thence they are adopted to denote calamity, disease, and death; thence also they are taken sometimes to denote those affections of the mind which are in their nature

⁴² Wisd. vii. 3.⁴³ § 8.

violent, and are considered as implying pain and suffering; nay, the English word *passion* is, in this manner, applied (but it is in a sort of technical language) to the death and sufferings of our Lord.

Now, as to the term *ὁμοιοπαθης*, in the manner in which it is rendered by our interpreters, the argument employed by the Apostles to the Lycaonians, loses all its force and significance. The Pagans never denied that the Gods whom they adored were beings of like passions with themselves; nay, they did not scruple to attribute the most disgraceful, and the most turbulent passions to their deities. And as little as any were the two divinities exempted, whom they supposed Paul and Barnabas to be; but then they always attributed to them a total exemption from mortality and disease. It would have been, therefore, impertinent to say to idolaters, who mistook them for gods, "We are subject to the like passions with you;" for this their priests and poets had uniformly taught them both of Jupiter and of Mercury. But it was pertinent to say, "We are your fellow-mortals," as liable as you to disease and death. For, if that was the case with the two Apostles, the people would readily admit, they were not the gods they took them for. Indeed, this was not only the principal, but, I may almost say, the sole, distinction they made between gods and men. As to irregular lusts and passions, they seem to have ascribed them to the celestials even in a higher degree, in proportion, as it were, to their superior power. And,

in regard to the application to Elijah, in the other passage quoted, let it not be thought any objection to the interpretation here given, that the Prophet was translated, and did not die: for all that is implied in the Apostle's argument is, that his body was naturally mortal and dissolvable as well as ours; a point which was never called in question, notwithstanding his miraculous deliverance from death. I shall only add, that the explanation here given is entirely conformable to the version of those passages in the Vulgate, and to that of all the other translations, ancient and modern, of any name.

§ 26. FROM all that has been said on this topic, it is evident that, in doubtful cases, etymology is but a dangerous guide; and, though always entitled to some attention, never, unless in the total failure of all other resources, to be entirely rested in. From her tribunal there lies always an appeal to *use*, in cases wherein use can be discovered, whose decision is final, according to the observation of Horace,

Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi.

I have been the more particular on this head, because etymology seems to be a favorite with many modern interpreters, and the source of a great proportion of their criticisms. And indeed, it must be owned that, of all the possible ways of becoming a critic in a dead or a foreign language, etymology is the easiest. A scanty knowledge of the elements, with the aid of a good Lexicon, and

a plausible fluency of expression, will be fully sufficient for the purpose. I shall add a few instances in this taste from some modern translations of the New Testament; though I am far from insinuating that the above mentioned qualifications for criticising, were all that the authors were possessed of. Some of them, on the contrary, have, in other instances, displayed critical abilities very respectable. But where is the man who, on every occasion, is equal to himself? The word *εσπλαγχνισθη*⁴⁴, is rendered, by the Gentlemen of Port Royal, *Ses entrailles furent emues de compassion*, on which Wynne seems to have improved in saying, *His bowels yearned with compassion*. *Ευδοκησαν*⁴⁵, is rendered by the former, *ont resolu avec beaucoup d'affection*. *Δησις ενεργουμενη*⁴⁶, is translated by Doddridge, *Prayer wrought by the energy of the Spirit*. *Σκηνωσει*⁴⁷, by Diodati, *Tendera un padiglione*. *Χειροτονησαντες*⁴⁸, by Beza, *cum ipsi per suffragia creassent*, and *κληρονομησοσι*⁴⁹, *hæreditario jure obtinebunt*. The Vulgate too, sometimes without necessity, but more rarely, adopts the same paraphractical method. For those examples above referred to, which occur in the Gospel, see the notes on the places.

⁴⁴ Matth. ix. 36.⁴⁵ Rom. xv. 26, 27.⁴⁶ James, v. 16.⁴⁷ Rev. vii. 15.⁴⁸ Acts, xiv. 23.⁴⁹ Matth. v. 5.

Dissertation the Fifth.

*Of the Proper Version of some Names of Principal Import in
the New Testament.*

THE religious institution of which the Lord Jesus is the author, is distinguished in the New Testament by particular names and phrases, with the true import of which it is of great consequence that we be acquainted, in order to form a distinct apprehension of the nature and end of the whole. A very small deviation here may lead some into gross mistakes, and conceal from others, in a considerable degree, the spirit which this institution breathes, and the discoveries which it brings. I think it necessary, therefore, to examine this subject a little, in order to lay before the critical, the judicious, and the candid, my reasons for leaving, in some particulars which at first may appear of little moment, the beaten track of interpreters, and giving, it may be said, new names to known things, where there cannot be any material difference of meaning. The affectation of rejecting a word, because old (if neither obscure nor obsolete,) and of preferring another, because new (if it be not more apposite or expressive,) is justly held contemptible; but without doubt, it would be an

extreme on the other side, not less hurtful, to pay a greater veneration to names, that is, to mere sounds, than to the things signified by them. And surely, a translator is justly chargeable with this fault, who, in any degree, sacrifices propriety, and that perspicuity which, in a great measure, flows from it, to a scrupulous (not to say superstitious) attachment to terms which, as the phrase is, have been consecrated by long use. But of this I shall have occasion to speak more afterwards.

The most common appellation given to this institution, or religious dispensation, in the New Testament, is, ἡ Βασιλεια τῆς Θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν; and the title given to the manifestation of this new state, is most frequently τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῆς Βασιλειᾶς &c. and sometimes, when considered under an aspect somewhat different, ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη. The great Personage himself, to whose administration the whole is intrusted, is, in contradistinction to all others, denominated ὁ Χριστός. I shall in this discourse make a few observations on each of the terms above mentioned.

PART I.

OF THE PHRASE

Ἡ Βασιλεια τῆς Θεοῦ, OR τῶν οὐρανῶν.

IN the phrase ἡ Βασιλεια τῆς Θεοῦ, or τῶν οὐρανῶν, there is a manifest allusion to the predictions in which this economy was revealed by the Prophets

in the Old Testament, particularly by the Prophet Daniel, who mentions it, in one place ¹, as a *Kingdom*, *Βασιλεια* which the God of heaven would set up, and which should never be destroyed: in another ², as a kingdom to be given, with glory and dominion over all people, nations, and languages, to one like a son of man. And the Prophet Micah ³, speaking of the same era, represents it as a time when Jehovah, having removed all the afflictions of his people, would reign over them in mount Zion thenceforth even for ever. To the same purpose, though not so explicit, are the declarations of other Prophets. To these predictions there is a manifest reference in the title *ἡ Βασιλεια τῆς Θεοῦ*, or *τῶν οὐρανῶν*, or simply *ἡ Βασιλεια*, given in the New Testament, to the religious constitution which would obtain under the Messiah. It occurs very often, and is, if I mistake not, uniformly, in the common translation, rendered *kingdom*.

§ 2. THAT the import of the term is always either *kingdom*, or something nearly related to kingdom, is beyond all question; but it is no less so, that, if regard be had to the propriety of our own idiom, and consequently to the perspicuity of the version, the English word will not answer on every occasion. In most cases *βασιλεια* answers to the Latin *regnum*. But this word is of more extensive meaning than the English, being equally adapted to express both our terms *reign* and

¹ ii. 44.² vii. 13, 14.³ iv. 6, 7.

kingdom. The first relates to the time or duration of the sovereignty; the second, to the place or country over which it extends. Now, though it is manifest in the Gospels, that it is much oftener the time, than the place, that is alluded to; it is never, in the common version, translated *reign*, but always *kingdom*. Yet the expression is often thereby rendered exceedingly awkward, not to say absurd. Use indeed softens every thing. Hence it is that, in reading our Bible, we are insensible of those improprieties which, in any other book, would strike us at first hearing. Such are those expressions which apply motion to a kingdom, as when mention is made of its *coming*, *approaching*, and the like; but I should not think it worth while to contend for the observance of a scrupulous propriety, if the violation of it did not affect the sense, and lead the reader into mistakes. Now this is, in several instances, the certain consequence of improperly rendering βασιλεια *kingdom*.

§ 3. WHEN βασιλεια means *reign*, and is followed by των ορανων, the translation *kingdom of heaven* evidently tends to mislead the reader. Heaven, thus construed with kingdom, ought, in our language, by the rules of grammatical propriety, to denote the region under the kingly government spoken of. But finding, as we advance, that this called the *kingdom of heaven* is actually upon the earth, or, as it were, travelling to the earth and almost arrived, there necessarily arises

such a confusion of ideas as clouds the text, and, by consequence, weakens the impression it would otherwise make upon our minds. It may be said indeed, that the import of such expressions in Scripture is now so well known, that they can hardly be mistaken. But I am far from thinking that this is the case. Were it said only that they are become so familiar to us that, without ever reflecting on the matter, we take it for granted that we understand them; there is no sentiment to the justness of which I can more readily subscribe. But then, the familiarity, instead of answering a good, answers a bad, purpose, as it serves to conceal our ignorance, even from ourselves. It is not, therefore, the being accustomed to hear such phrases, that will make them be universally, or even generally, apprehended by the people. And to those who may have heard of the exposition commonly given of them, the conception of the kingdom of heaven, as denoting a sort of dominion upon the earth, a conception which the mind attains indirectly, by the help of a comment, is always feebler than that which is conveyed directly by the native energy of the expression. Not but that the words βασιλεια των ουρανων are sometimes rightly translated *kingdom of heaven*, being manifestly applied to the state of perfect felicity to be enjoyed in the world to come. But it is equally evident that this is not always the meaning of the phrase.

§ 4. THERE are two senses wherein the word *heaven* in this expression may be understood,

Either it signifies the place so called, or it is a metonymy for God, who is in Scripture, sometimes by periphrasis, denominated *he that dwelleth in heaven*. When the former is the sense of the term *σπανοι*, the phrase is properly rendered *the kingdom of heaven*; when the latter, *the reign of heaven*. Let it be remarked in passing, in regard to the sense last given of the word *σπανοι* as signifying *God*, that we are fully authorized to affirm it to be scriptural. I should have hardly thought it necessary to make this remark, if I had not occasionally observed such phrases as *the assistance of heaven*, and *addresses to heaven*, criticised and censured, in some late performances, as savouring more of the Pagan, or the Chinese, phraseology, than of the Christian. That they are perfectly conformable to the latter, must be clear to every one who reads his Bible with attention. Daniel, in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, says⁴, *Thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the Heavens do rule*. The Prophet had said in the preceding verse, *Seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men*. Thus he who is denominated the *Most High* in one verse, is termed *the Heavens* in the following. The Psalmist Asaph says of profligates⁵, *They set their mouth against the Heavens*; that is, *they vent blasphemies against God*. The phrase in the New Testament *ἡ βασιλεια των σπανων*, is almost as com-

⁴ iv. 26.

⁵ Psal. lxxiii. 9.

mon as ἡ βασιλεια τῆς Θεοῦ. And though it may be affirmed that the regimen in the one expresses the proprietor of the kingdom, in the other the place; it is evident that this does not hold always. In parallel passages in the different Gospels, where the same facts are recorded, the former of these expressions is commonly used by Matthew, and the other as equivalent, by the other Evangelists. Nay, the phrase ἡ βασιλεια των σφρανων, is adopted, when it is manifest, that the place of dominion suggested is earth, not heaven; and that, therefore, the term can be understood only as a synonyma for θεοῦ. The prodigal says to his father⁶, *Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before thee; that is, against God and thee.* Otherwise, to speak of sinning against an inanimate object, would be exceedingly unsuitable both to the Christian theology and to the Jewish. *The baptism of John*⁷, says our Lord, *whence was it; from Heaven, or of men? From Heaven, that is, from God.* Divine authority is here opposed to human. This difference, however, in the sense of σφρανος, makes no difference to a translator, inasmuch as the vernacular term with us admits the same latitude with the Hebrew and the Greek.

§ 5. THAT βασιλεια ought sometimes to be rendered *reign*, and not *kingdom*, I shall further evince when I illustrate the import of the words κηρυσσω, ευαγγελιζω, and some others. Isaiah,

⁶ Luke, xv. 18. 21.

⁷ Matth. xxi. 25.

Daniel, Micah, and others of the Prophets, had encouraged the people to expect a time, when the Lord of hosts should reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, when the people of God should be redeemed from their enemies, and made joyful in the Messiah their King. It was this happy epoch that was generally understood to be denominated by the phrases βασιλεια τῆ Θεου, and βασιλεια τῶν οὐρανῶν, *the reign of God*, and *the reign of Heaven*: the approach of which was first announced by the Baptist, afterwards by our Lord himself, and his Apostles. Βασιλεια is applicable in both acceptations, and it needs only to be observed that, when it refers to the time, it ought to be rendered *reign*, when to the place, *kingdom*. For this reason, when it is construed with the verb κηρυσσω, εὐαγγελίζω, καταγγελλω, or the noun εὐαγγελιον, it ought invariably to be *reign*, as also when it is spoken of as come, coming, or approaching.

§ 6. THE French have two words corresponding to ours, *regne* reign, and *royaume* kingdom. Their interpreters have often fallen into the same fault with ours, substituting the latter word for the former: yet, in no French translation that I have seen, is this done so uniformly as in ours. In the Lord's Prayer, for example, they all say, *ton regne vienne*, not *ton royaume*, thy *reign* come, not thy *kingdom*. On the other hand, when mention is made of entrance or admission into the βασιλεια, or exclusion from it, or where there is a manifest reference to the state of the blessed hereafter; in

all these cases, and perhaps a few others, wherein the sense may easily be collected from the context, it ought to be rendered *kingdom*, and not *reign*.

§ 7. THERE are a few passages, it must be acknowledged, in which neither of the English words can be considered as a translation of *βασιλεια* strictly proper. In some of the parables⁸, it evidently means administration, or method of governing; and in one of them⁹, the word denotes royalty, or royal authority, there being a manifest allusion to what had been done by Herod the Great, and his immediate successor, in recurring to the Roman senate in order to be invested with the title and dignity of King of Judea, then dependent upon Rome. But where there is a proper attention to the scope of the place, one will be at no loss to discover the import of the word.

⁸ Matth. xviii. 23.

⁹ Luke, xix. 12. 15.

PART II.

OF THE NAME *το Ευαγγελιον*.

I PROCEED to inquire into the meaning of the word *το Ευαγγελιον*. This term, agreeably to its etymology, from *ευ bene* and *αγγελια nuncium*, always in classical use, where it occurs but rarely, denotes either *good news*, or the reward given to *the bearer* of good news. Let us see what ought to be accounted the scriptural use of the term. *Ευαγγελιον* and *ευαγγελια* occur six times in the Septuagint in the books of Samuel and Kings. I reckon them as one word, because they are of the same origin, are used indiscriminately, and always supply the place of the same Hebrew word *בשרה besharah*. In five of these the meaning is *good news*; in the sixth, the word denotes the reward given for bringing good news. In like manner, the verb *ευαγγελιζειν*, or *ευαγγελιζεσθαι*, which occurs much oftener in the Septuagint than the noun, is always the version of the Hebrew verb *בשר bashar, læta annunciare*, to tell good news. It ought to be remarked also, that *ευαγγελιζω* is the only word by which the Hebrew verb is rendered into Greek: nor do I know any word in the Greek language that is more strictly of one signification than this verb. In one instance

the verbal מְבַשֵּׂר *mebasher*, is indeed used for one who brings tidings, though not good¹⁰; but in that place the Seventy have not employed the verb *εὐαγγελίζω* or any of its derivatives. One passage¹¹, wherein the Septuagint uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, has also been alleged as an exception from the common acceptation. But that this is improperly called an exception, must be manifest to every one who reflects that the total defeat of the Israelitish army, with the slaughter of the king of Israel and his sons, must have been the most joyful tidings that could have been related in Gath and Askelon, two Philistine cities. The word occurs several times in the Prophets, particularly in Isaiah, and is always rendered in the common version, either by the phrase *to bring good tidings*, or by some terms nearly equivalent. It is sometimes also so rendered in the New Testament¹².

§ 2. Now, let it be observed, that when the word is introduced in the Gospels, it is generally either in a quotation from the Prophets, or in evident allusion to their words. Thus *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*, which our translators render, *To the poor the gospel is preached*¹³, the whole context shows to be in allusion to what is said by the Prophet Isaiah¹⁴, in whom the corresponding

¹⁰ 1 Sam. iv. 17.¹¹ 2 Sam. i. 20.¹² Luke, i. 19. ii. 10. viii. 1. Acts, xiii. 32. Rom. x. 15. 1 Thess. iii. 6.¹³ Matth. xi. 5. Luke, vii. 22.¹⁴ lxi. 1.

phrase is rendered, *preach good tidings to the meek*. But nothing can be more to my purpose, than that noted passage wherein we are told¹⁵, that the place in Isaiah was read by our Lord in the synagogue of Nazareth. The words in the common translation of the Gospel are these, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel, εὐαγγελιζέσθαι, to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord*. Now I cannot help observing of this passage, that the meaning would have been more perspicuously conveyed, and its beauty and energy would have been better preserved, if our translators had kept closer to the manner in which they had rendered it in the Old Testament. There the term εὐγαλιζέσθαι is rendered *to preach good tidings*. And though it is certain, agreeably to our Lord's declaration, that the Gospel, with its spiritual blessings, is here held forth to us, it is still under the figure of temporal blessings, and therefore it is very improperly introduced by its distinguishing appellation into the version, which ought to convey the literal, not the figurative, sense of the original.

Εὐαγγελιζέσθαι πτωχοῖς, to bring good tidings to the poor or afflicted, agreeably to the extensive signification of the Hebrew word, is the general title of the message, and comprehends the whole. It

¹⁵ Luke, iv. 18, 19.

is explained by being branched out into the particulars which immediately follow. For, if it be asked, What is the good tidings brought to the afflicted? the answer is, a cure to the broken-hearted, deliverance to the captives, sight to the blind. It is the Lord's jubilee, which brings freedom to the slave, acquittance to the debtor, and relief to the oppressed. Now that the Gospel is herein admirably delineated, is manifest. But still it is presented to us under figures, and therefore, to mention it by its peculiar title, in the midst of the figurative description, is to efface, in a great measure, that description; it is to jumble injudiciously the sign and the thing signified. It is, as if one should confound, in an apologue or parable, the literal sense with the moral, and assert of the one what is strictly true only of the other; by which means no distinct image would be presented to the mind. Or it is, as when a painter supplies the defects in his work by labels, and instead of a picture, presents us with a confused jumble, wherein some things are painted, and some things described in words. But it is not in our version only, but in most modern translations, that this confusion in rendering this beautiful passage has appeared.

§ 3. I SHALL add but one other instance of a quotation from the prophets: *Ως ὠραιοὶ οἱ ποδες των ευαγγελιζομενων ειρηνην, των ευαγγελιζομενων τα αγαθα*¹⁶. In the common version, as quoted

¹⁶ Romans, x. 15.

in the New Testament: *How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things.* It would have been better here also, on many accounts, to keep closer to the original in Isaiah ¹⁷ whence the passage was taken, and to translate it thus: "How beautiful are the feet of them who bring the joyful message of peace, the joyful news of good things;" at the same time, I acknowledge, it is with a particular allusion to that spiritual peace, and those eternal good things, procured to us by Jesus Christ. But the beauty and energy of the allusion and implied similitude are destroyed, or rather, there is no more allusion, or similitude in the words, when the characteristic description, intended by the prophet, is in a manner thrown aside, and in its stead is inserted the name appropriated to the dispensation. This, at least, is in part done; for the Prophet's figures are neither totally laid aside, nor totally retained. Instead of imitating his simplicity of manner, they have made a jumble of the sense implied, and the sense expressed. For this purpose they have rendered the same word (which is repeated in the two clauses) in one clause, *preach the gospel*, according to the sense justly supposed to be figured by it, in the other clause, *bring glad tidings*, according to the letter. I can see no reason for this want of uniformity, unless perhaps the notion that *the gospel of good things* sounded more awkwardly than *the gospel of peace*.

§ 4. THE Prophet's design undoubtedly was, to deliver it as an universal truth, amply confirmed by experience, that the message of peace and prosperity to those who had been oppressed and afflicted by the ravages of war, and its various unhappy consequences, was so charming, that it could transform a most disagreeable, into a pleasing, object. The feet of those who had travelled far, in a hot country, through rough and dusty roads, present a spectacle naturally offensive to the beholder; nevertheless, the consideration that the persons themselves are, to us, the messengers of peace and felicity; and that it is, in bringing these welcome tidings, they have contracted that sordid appearance, can in an instant convert deformity into beauty, and make us behold, with delight, this indication of their embassy, their dirty feet, as being the natural consequence of the long journey they have made. A thought somewhat similar occurs in Horace¹⁷, who, speaking of victors returning, with glory, from a well-fought field, exhibits them as—*Non indecoro pulvere sordidos*. The poet perceives a charm, something decorous, in the very dust and sweat, with which the warriors are smeared, and which serve to recal to the mind of the spectator, the glorious toils of the day: thus, things in themselves ugly and disgusting, share, when associated in the mind with things delightful, in the beauty and attractions of those things with which they are connected. But this sentiment is lost in the common version; for

¹⁷ Lib. ii. Ode i.

it might puzzle the most sagacious reader to devise a reason why the feet in particular of the Christian preacher should be declared to excel in beauty.

§ 5. Now, in all the passages quoted from the Prophets, it appears so natural, and so proper every way, to give them in the words which had been used in translating the prophecies, when the words in the New Testament will bear the same version, that one is at a loss to conceive what could move the translators to depart from this rule. Ought they, where no ground is given for it, in the original, either to make the sacred penmen appear to have misquoted the Prophets, or to make the unlearned reader imagine, that the Scriptures used by them, differed from those used by us, where there is not, in fact, any difference? Let it be observed, that I say, when the words in the New Testament will bear the same version with those in the Old; for I am not for carrying this point so far as some translators have done, who, when there is a real difference in the import of the expressions, are for correcting one of the sacred writers by the other. This is not the part of a faithful translator, who ought candidly to represent what his author says, and leave it to the judicious critic, to account for such differences as he best can. But it is surely a more inexcusable error to make differences, where there are none; than to attempt to cover them, where there are. Now, as it was never pretended that, in the passages above quoted, the Hebrew word was not

justly translated by the Seventy, and that the sense of both was not justly expressed by the phrase which our translators had employed in the version of the Prophets, they had no reason for adopting a different, though it were a synonymous phrase, in rendering the passage when quoted in the New. What shall we say then of their employing an expression which conveys a very different meaning ?

§ 6. I SHALL produce one example, which, though no quotation, yet, having a direct reference to a promise often mentioned in the Old Testament, and made originally to the Patriarchs, ought to have been interpreted in the most comprehensive way. Our translators, by not attending to this, have rendered a passage otherwise perspicuous perfectly unintelligible. *Και γαρ εσμεν ευηγγελισμενοι, καθαπερ κακεινοι* ; in the common version, *For unto us was the gospel preached as well as unto them*¹⁹. He had been speaking of the Israelites under Moses in the wilderness. This sounds strangely in Christian ears. That the Gospel has been preached to us, needs no affirmation to convince us : our only difficulty is, to understand in what sense the Gospel, or religious institution of Jesus Christ, was preached to those who lived and died before his incarnation. Yet it seems here to be supposed that we all know that the Gospel was preached to them, but need to be informed that it has ever been preached to

¹⁹ Heb. iv. 2.

ourselves. Had it been said, *For unto them was the gospel preached as well as unto us*, we should have discovered a meaning in the sentence, though we might have been at a loss to conceive in what respect it is defensible. But, as it stands, we are no less puzzled about the meaning, than about the truth of the observation. Now, the literal and proper translation of the word *ευαγγελιζομαι*, in an instant, removes every difficulty. *For unto us the good tidings are published which were published to them*. What these good tidings are, is evident from the context. It is the promise of rest to God's people. It had been shown by the Apostle, in the preceding chapter, that the promise first made to the patriarchs was not, if I may so express myself, exhausted by the admission of the Israelites into the land of Canaan : that, on the contrary, we learn, from a threat in the Psalms against the rebellious, that there was still a nobler country and superior happiness men had to look for, of which the earthly Canaan was but a figure ; that therefore we ought to take warning, from the example of those whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, to beware lest we also forfeit, through unbelief, that glorious inheritance, the rest that yet remains for the people of God. Now, as the promises conveying the good news of rest, were originally made to the fathers, and to Israel, according to the flesh, it was pertinent to take notice that we are equally interested in them, and that this good news of rest in a happy country afterwards to be enjoyed, is declared to us as fully as ever it was to them. This sense, though

clearly the Apostle's, is totally effaced by the misinterpretation of the word *ευηγγελισμενοι*. The Vulgate has, in this place, kept clear of the glaring impropriety in the English version. It has simply, *Etenim et nobis nuntiatum est quemadmodum et illis*. Their common way, however, is different.

§ 7. IN other places, most modern translators have been misled, in this article, by implicitly following the Vulgate, which first set the bad example of translating those passages differently, in the Old Testament, and in the New. In the passage quoted from Paul, and by him from Isaiah, Erasmus has very well preserved both the import of the word, and the conformity to the way in which it had been always justly rendered in the Prophet, *Quam speciosi pedes annuntiantium pacem, annuntiantium bona!* To the same purpose Castalio, who has taken this way, which Erasmus had not done, of rendering also the words read by our Lord in the synagogue, *Me ad læta pauperibus nuntianda misit*. In the other places above referred to, Castalio follows the common method. *Pauperes evangelium docentur*. Erasmus, in rendering the passage quoted from Matthew, has endeavoured to comprehend both ways. *Pauperes lætum accipiunt evangelii nuntium*. He has in this been copied by the translator of Zurich. This method is quite paraphrastical. It does not savour of the simplicity of the evangelical style. If *ευαγγελιον* mean *lætum nuntium*, why did he add *evangelii*? And if it do not mean

lætum nuncium, what had these words to do in the version? And if the Latin *evangelium* is of the same import with the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, the sentence is a mere tautology; as if he should say, *The poor receive the good news of glad tidings*. And, if the import of the adoptive Latin word *evangelium* be different, which is in fact the case, from that of the Greek, which is fully interpreted by the two words *lætum nuntium*, *evangelii* is a mere interpolation. The words of the original are general, and have equal latitude of signification with the Latin *lætum nuncium*, or the English *good news*. The addition of the word *evangelii* limits the sense in a way which the Prophet's expression does not warrant. Nor does an interpreter's opinion concerning the completion of the prophecy (however true, nay, however certain, that opinion be) entitle him to express the prediction with greater speciality of meaning than has been done by his author. Erasmus does not seem himself to have been entirely satisfied with this circumlocution, as he has rendered the same words in Luke in the common way, and in this also has been followed by the Tigurine translator. Beza has in all the passages above referred to, (except that in which the Vulgate was right,) followed the Vulgate, and has been followed by most of the early Protestant translators.

§ 8. SOME may imagine, that I am here pleading for what, on other occasions, I have shown no partiality to, a translation of the words servilely

literal or etymological. But, let it be observed, that I am never for tracing in the translation, the etymology of the words of the original, when the etymology does not give the just import of the words, according to the received use at the time when the speeches or dialogues related were spoken, or when the book was composed. The Greek verb *εὐαγγελίζω*, when first used by the Evangelists, or the Hebrew *בשר* *bashar*, when used by the Prophets, or the Syriac *סבר* *sabar*, as most probably used by our Lord and his Apostles, conveyed to their countrymen only one and the same idea, which is precisely what the phrase *to bring good tidings* conveys to us. The appropriation of the word to the religious institution called the Gospel, is of a later date, and has gradually arisen out of the former usage. When etymology and use entirely coincide, as they often do, we cannot be too literal in our interpretations; when they differ, which does not seldom happen, the latter is to be followed, and not the former.

In some respects, similar, though apparently, contrary, to the above objection, is that of those who urge that our term *Gospel*, in its Saxon etymology, is an exact counterpart to the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*, being compounded of two words, which conjoined denote *good news*. But, the only pertinent question is, in this case, Is this the present meaning of the English word *Gospel*? The first objectors would assign to the Greek word *εὐαγγέλιον*, a sense which it had not during our Lord's ministry, but which it acquired soon

after: the second would put upon the English word *Gospel*, a sense which it once had, but now has not. That this is the case is evident.

Should one, for example, bring us word²⁰ that an end is put to hostilities, and that the powers at war have at last agreed upon a peace, ought we, in reporting this intelligence, to say, that one had come preaching to us the gospel of peace? Whoever should express himself thus, would, I am afraid, be thought to talk both absurdly and profanely. At least, he would be said to employ a very bold and far-fetched metaphor. Yet, not the metaphorical, but the proper expression, in the language of the Apostles, would be, *ενηγγελισατο ἡμιν ειρηνην*, or even *εκηρυξεν ἡμιν το ευαγγελιον της ειρηνης*. Josephus, in his History of the Jewish War²¹, acquainting us that Titus sent to his father the good news of his taking Tarichea, says, *Τιτος δε εκπεμψας τινα των ιππεων ευαγγελιζεται τω πατρι το εργον*. How would it sound in our ears to render it, *preached to his father the gospel of the action*? Nothing can be a stronger evidence that the Greek phrases above mentioned, and the English *preached the gospel*, are not equivalent. All, therefore, that can be concluded from the primitive import of the word *Gospel*, in a different, though related, language, is that, in the Anglo-Saxon, not the English, version of the New Testament, the word *ευαγγελιον* was

²⁰ This was written towards the end of the American war.

²¹ Lib. iii. ch. 34.

rightly so translated. Certain it is, however, that the error remarked in the English version, runs through all the modern translations, as well as the Vulgate which gave it birth, and is a remarkable instance of the truth of an observation formerly made²² that, sometimes, by consulting other versions, we may be confirmed in an error, instead of having it corrected. Indeed the old Latin translation has served, in many things, as will appear more fully afterwards, as a model to the translators in the West.

§ 9. BUT, though the noun *ευαγγελιον* was equally unequivocal with the verb *ευαγγελιζω*, in its acceptation in the Old Testament, and commonly in the Evangelists, it must be owned that, from its original signification, it came insensibly afterwards to vary and receive other meanings, in the way I shall now attempt to explain. The word occurs very often in the New Testament, where, as it is a term of principal importance, its different significations deserve to be investigated, with the greatest accuracy. That the radical signification, *good news*, is not only the most common, but, in some respect, a concomitant of every other meaning affixed to the word, must be evident to every one who is conversant with the original. Yet this allusive concomitance, if I may so express myself, is an advantage which cannot be obtained in a translation. As use, which governs language, will not bend to our inclinations,

²² Diss. II. Part III. § 6.

we must change the word in the version, when the import of the original name is so far different, that the same term, in another language, will not answer; yet, by changing it, we may lose the emphasis, which results from the allusion to the primitive and predominant application of the word. It will sometimes happen, in a train of reasoning, where the same word is used in the original, in different, but related, senses, that the change of the corresponding term, in the version, will hurt perspicuity, and yet may be necessary, because the same word in another language, whose idiom does not admit the same extent of signification, would hurt it more.

§ 10. THE first meaning of the word then in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, is, as has been observed, *good news*, a signification which, though always implied, is not always what is chiefly intended; and therefore the word cannot, without a sacrifice of propriety, be uniformly rendered so. The name, from being expressive of an eminent quality in the dispensation introduced by the Messiah, and from being most frequently applied to it, came gradually to serve as a name for the dispensation itself. When it is thus employed, it is in our tongue properly rendered *gospel*. This is the second meaning of the word. Of the other senses which it has in Scripture, I shall take notice afterwards. The two above mentioned are the chief. And, first, I shall consider the cases wherein that which I call

the literal and primitive signification, ought to be retained.

§ 11. FIRST then, this sense ought to be retained in the version, when the word *εὐαγγέλιον* is construed with a noun serving to limit or explain its nature, as *το εὐαγγέλιον τῆς εἰρηνης*, *the good news of peace*, *το εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλειας*, *the good news of the reign*. It was observed, on the explanation of the word *Βασιλεια*, that the Christian economy was foretold under the denomination of *the reign of God*, and *the reign of Heaven*; and I may add, in the typical language of the Psalms, *the reign of David*. Now, there were, about the time of our Saviour's appearance, many who, from the predictions of the Prophets, and signs of the times, waited, with pious confidence, for the consolation of Israel, that is, for the coming of the Lord's Messiah, and the commencement of his glorious reign. This was the great subject of comfort to them, amidst all the distresses and oppressions, personal or political, under which they groaned. For, how erroneous soever the prevalent notions concerning the person of the Messiah, and the nature of his reign, were; they agreed in this, that they exhibited him as a deliverer, in whose time, the principal grievances of the nation were to be redressed; and, in consequence of this, the people looked forward with faith and hope, but not without a mixture of impatience, to that long-deferred, as they then thought, but happy era, the mission and consequent reign of the Messiah. Freedom to the slave, release

to the prisoner, pardon to the convict, could not be more welcome, or afford matter of greater joy, than the tidings, well authenticated, that that blessed period, spoken of in raptures by their Prophets, and described in the most glowing colours of Eastern poetry, was at length arrived. Hence it is not improbable that, even some time before the birth of Jesus, this much wished event came to be denominated, by those who expected it, perhaps the majority of the nation, *the good news* (being such in an eminent manner,) and more explicitly *the good news of the reign of God*, that is, of the new dispensation that would obtain under the promised Messiah.

§ 12. A NUMBER of such-like phrases, borrowed from the Prophets, and from the Psalms, relating to this event, had become current among the people, and were adopted both by our Lord and by John his harbinger. Thus the Messiah himself is styled *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, *he that cometh*, not *he that should come*, as it is less properly rendered in the common version, it being an abbreviation of that expression of the Psalmist²³, *He that cometh in the name of the Lord*. Now it is manifest that, when first the Baptist, then our Lord himself, and lastly his Apostles, in his lifetime, announced publicly the approach of this reign; they announced what the generality of the people would immediately, and without difficulty, apprehend. I do not mean, that they would under-

²³ cxviii. 26.

stand the nature of the reign or spiritual dominion to be established; for this is what few or none did; but that they would immediately understand it to relate to the accession of the Messiah, their great deliverer, to that sovereignty with which they had learnt from the Prophets, and from the scribes, that he was to be invested. The dispensation, therefore, is properly ushered in with an authoritative call to all men to amend their lives, and prepare for the reign of the Messiah, the expectation and joy of God's people, just about to commence. Nothing, therefore, could be more suitable, and, though alarming to the wicked, nothing could be more consolatory to the pious, at the time the nation was in subjection to a foreign and oppressive yoke, than such seasonable information. Nothing, consequently, can be better accommodated to what must have been the sentiments and prospects of the people at that time, or can more accurately express the full import of the original, *κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας τῆς Θεου*, than this literal and plain version, *Proclaiming the glad tidings of the reign of God*. This conveys to us, at this moment, the same ideas which, in those circumstances, must have been conveyed by the words of the sacred historian, into the mind of every Jewish reader at the time.

§ 13. ON the contrary, the expression in the vulgar translation, *preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God*, must have been to such a reader unintelligible; as even to us, when we abstract from

the familiarity occasioned by custom, which is apt to impose upon us, it appears both obscure and improper. Castalio, in one place²⁴, departs, if possible, still farther from the sense, rendering it *regium publicans evangelium*, “publishing the “royal gospel.” Not to mention the futility of the term *royal*, applied in a way which renders it a mere expletive; the very subject published, ἡ βασιλεια, *the reign*, is justled out to make room for a splendid but unmeaning epithet. Our Lord, we find from the Evangelists, spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used those names to which the reading of the Law and the Prophets, either in the original, or in the version then used, had familiarized them. Our translators, and indeed, most European translators, represent him as using words which, even in their own translations of the Old Testament, never occur, and to which, in fact, there is nothing there that corresponds in meaning. The people had all heard of the reign of the Messiah, to be established in the latter times, and considered the arrival of that period as the happiest tidings with which they could be made acquainted. But of the *Gospel* they had never heard before. “What is this “you call the Gospel?” they would naturally ask; “and what does the *Gospel of a kingdom* “mean?” These are words to which our ears are strangers. No mention is made of such things in the Law, in the Prophets, or in the Psalms.

²⁴ Matth. iv. 23.

§ 14. Now, if the terms must have been altogether unintelligible to Jews, they are, even to us Christians, both obscure and improper. First, obscure, because indefinite. It does not appear easy in such circumstances, as those under consideration, to assign a precise meaning to the word *Gospel*. We commonly understand by it the whole religious institution of Jesus, including both doctrines and precepts. Nothing can be plainer than that this is not the meaning of the term here. The very words which were preached or promulgated, are expressly mentioned, and comprised in a single sentence: *Μετανοειτε, ηγγικε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων*. Besides, the Apostles, who, in our Lord's lifetime, received this commission, were not yet qualified for teaching the system of doctrine implied under the name *Gospel*, because, in fact, they did not know it themselves. They had then no notion of a Messiah, but as a temporal prince, and mighty conqueror, or of his kingdom, but as a secular monarchy, more extensive than, but of the same nature with, those, which had preceded, to wit, the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian empires, or, that which was in being at the time, the Roman. Not one of their hearers could have been more prejudiced, than the Apostles themselves were, at that time, against a suffering Saviour, who was to expire, in agonies and infamy, on a cross.

Now, let people but coolly reflect, and then put the question to themselves; If we set aside these important truths, the death, and consequently

the resurrection of Jesus Christ, his victory over the enemies of our salvation, and his purchase of spiritual and eternal blessings, by his blood; of all which the Apostles were then ignorant, and against most of which, when first informed of them, they were as much prejudiced as any Pharisee, what will remain of that which we denominate the Gospel, in contradiction to Judaism? The doctrine of the Gospel is, manifestly, what the Apostles were not qualified to teach, till they were enlightened by the descent of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, after our Lord's ascension. Nay, they were, after his resurrection, when they knew more than formerly, expressly commanded, before they should attempt to teach that doctrine, to wait the promised illumination from above²⁵. But they had been, long before, sufficiently qualified to announce the approach of this dispensation, and to warn men to forsake their sins, and to prepare for the appearance of their Lord and King. Further, if the term *gospel* here be rather indefinite, how does this addition, *of the kingdom*, serve either to illustrate or to limit the import of that term? And an addition, which answers neither of these purposes, cannot fail still farther to darken it.

§ 15. BUT, secondly, that expression in our language is, in those instances, also improper; because there is no meaning which use has affixed

²⁵ Acts, i. 4. 8.

to the English word *Gospel*, that expresses the sense of the original. And, as it has been shown that our term does not there suit the word *εὐαγγέλιον*, I mean afterwards to show that the word *preaching* does not exactly convey the sense of *κηρυσσῶν*. At the same time, it is acknowledged, on the other hand, that the word *εὐαγγέλιον* is, in many places, in the Epistles of Paul, rightly rendered *Gospel*. But this is manifestly, as has been shown, a secondary sense of later date.

§ 16. I OBSERVED that, when the word *εὐαγγέλιον* is construed with a noun serving to limit or explain its nature, it ought to be rendered *good news*. But every regimen is not to be understood as serving this purpose. Thus, when it is followed with *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, with *τοῦ Κυρίου*, or *τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which denote the author, it is justly regarded as a name for the dispensation, and properly rendered *Gospel*. In the phrase *το εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, not preceded by *Ἰησοῦ*, the regimen may denote either the author or the subject. In the first view, it is *the Gospel of Christ*, that is, instituted by him; in the second, *the good news of the Messiah*, that is, concerning him. There are, perhaps, a few other cases in which the choice may be a matter of indifference. But, in most cases, the regimen ascertains the sense. Thus, *το εὐαγγέλιον τῆς εἰρημῆς*²⁶ can be no other than *the good news of peace*. The addition plainly

²⁶ Eph. vi. 15.

indicates the subject. For the same reason, *το ευαγγελιον της χαριτος Θεου*²⁷, is *the good news of the favour of God*; *το ευαγγελιον της σωτηριας υμων*²⁸, *the good news of your salvation*. The words in the common version, *the gospel of your salvation*, are mere words, and convey no meaning to English ears.—The second case wherein the word always may, and commonly should, be rendered *good news*, and not *gospel*, is when it is construed with *κηρυσσω* *I proclaim* or *publish*. The justness of this observation will be manifest, from what I shall afterwards observe on the import of that verb in the Gospels and Acts.

§ 17. THE third case is, when it clearly refers to a different subject from what is commonly with us denominated the Gospel. Under this, perhaps, may be ranked some of the examples which also come under the first case mentioned. For instance, *το ευαγγελιον της σωτηριας υμων*, *the good news of your salvation*. For here the tidings to which the Apostle refers, was not the embassy itself of peace by Jesus Christ; but it was the cordial reception which the Ephesians had given to that embassy, and which was to him who loved them, good news, because a pledge of their salvation. Under the same case also, in my opinion, we ought to class that famous passage in the Apocalypse²⁹, *I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting*

²⁷ Acts, xx. 24.²⁸ Eph. i. 13.²⁹ xiv. 6, 7.

gospel (so are the words *εχοντα ευαγγελιον αιωνιον* rendered in the common version,) *to preach to them that dwell on the earth ; and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come, and worship him, &c.* My reasons are, first, we are expressly informed what the angel had to proclaim, *κηρυσσειν*, which is all contained in the 7th verse, and relates to a particular event long posterior to the first propagation of the Gospel, namely, the vengeance God would take on the persecutors of his church, expressed in these words, *The hour of his judgment is come.* The rest of the verse is to be understood merely as a warning naturally suggested by the occasion. Nor let it be urged, that the approach of the hour of judgment looks rather like bad news than good. It frequently holds, that the tidings which to one are the most doleful, are to another the most joyous. The visions and prophecies of that Book are all directed to the churches of Christ, and intended for their use. To crush their enemies, was to relieve the churches : the defeat of the one, was the victory of the other. Secondly, what the angel had to promulgate, is not called *το ευαγγελιον*, as the word is almost uniformly used, when referring to the Christian dispensation, but simply *ευαγγελιον*, not *the Gospel*, the institution of Christ,—not that which is emphatically styled *the good news*, but barely *good news*. It is styled *αιωνιον*, everlasting, with the same propriety, and in the same latitude, as things of long duration, or

of permanent consequences, are often, in Scripture, so denominated.

§ 18. AGAIN, let it be observed that, by the English word *gospel*, we do not always mean precisely the same thing. The predominant sense is doubtless the religious institution of Jesus Christ. But this is not invariably its meaning. Early, in the church, the word *εὐαγγέλιον* was employed to denote, and, in one passage of the New Testament, actually denotes, the history of the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of the Son of God. It is in this sense that the four histories or narratives, written by Mathew, Mark, Luke, and John, containing memoirs of that extraordinary Personage, have, from the earliest antiquity, been titled *εὐαγγέλια*, *Gospels*. The word is thus used by Mark³⁰, *Αρχη τῆς εὐαγγελίᾳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*. I confess, however, that it would not be easy to decide, whether this ought to be accounted part of the sacred text, or a title afterwards prefixed (as were the names of the penmen, by some of the first transcribers,) which may have been inadvertently admitted into the text. But whether this application be scriptural or not, it is very ancient, and has obtained universally in the church. The English word has precisely the same application. It may be proper here to remark that, though the Greek word *εὐαγγέλιον* has been adopted by the Syriac inter-

³⁰ i. 1.

preters, yet, in the historical part, they admit it only into the titles of the four Gospels, in the sense last mentioned, and into the first verse of Mark's Gospel, where the sense is the same. Their use of the Greek word in these places is exactly similar to the use which our translators have made of the words of the Septuagint, *Genesis* and *Exodus*, which serve for names to the two first Books of the Pentateuch, but which they have never employed in the body of the work, where the words *γενεσις* and *εξοδος* occur in that version. Thus in every other passage of the Gospels, and Acts, *εναγγελιον* is rendered סַבְרַתָּה *sabbartha*, a plain Syriac word of the same signification and similar origin. In this the Syriac interpreters appear to have acted more judiciously than the Latin, as they have been sensible of the impropriety of darkening some of the plainest, but most important declarations, by the unnecessary introduction of an exotic term which had no meaning, or at least not the proper meaning in their language. In Paul's Epistles, I acknowledge they have several times adopted the Greek word; but let it be observed that, in these, the term *εναγγελιον* is frequently employed in a different sense. This has, in part, appeared already, but will be still more evident, from what immediately follows.

§ 19. THE fourth sense of *εναγγελιον* in the New Testament is the ministry of the Gospel. In this acceptation I find the word used oftener than once by the Apostle Paul. Thus, *God is my*

witness, whom I serve, with my spirit, in the gospel of his Son³¹, *εν τω ευαγγελιω*, that is, in the ministry of the Gospel, or in dispensing the Gospel of his Son. This is one of the passages in which the Syriac interpreter has retained the original word. In another place³², *What is my reward then? Verily that when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ, το ευαγγελιον, without charge*; that is, that the ministry of the Gospel of Christ may not by me be rendered chargeable. This the context plainly shows; for this is the only expence he is here speaking of. I think for perspicuity's sake, the word *ministry* should have been used in the translation, as the English name *Gospel* hardly admits this meaning. Nor are these the only places wherein the word has this signification³³.

§ 20. I OBSERVE also, in the Epistles of this Apostle, a fifth meaning, or at least a particular application of the first general meaning, *good news*. It sometimes denotes, not the whole Christian dispensation, but some particular doctrine or promise, specially meriting that denomination. In this sense Paul uses the word, writing to the Galatians³⁴. The particular doctrine to which he gives the pertinent appellation *ευαγγελιον*, *good news*, is the free admission of the Gentiles into the church of Christ, without subjecting them to circumcision, and the other ceremonies of the law.

³¹ Rom. i. 9.

³² 1 Cor. ix. 13.

³³ See 2 Cor. viii. 13. and Phil. iv. 15.

³⁴ ii. 2.

This, considering the Jewish prejudices at that time, accounts for the reserve which he used at Jerusalem, where, by his own representation, he imparted privately to the disciples of chief distinction, and consequently of most enlarged knowledge and sentiments, that doctrine which he publicly proclaimed, in Gentile countries. . I think it is this which the Apostle sometimes, by way of distinction, denominates *his Gospel*. For, though there was no discordancy in the doctrine taught by the different Apostles, yet to him and Barnabas, the Apostles of the uncircumcision, it was specially committed to announce every where among the heathen, God's gracious purpose of receiving them, uncircumcised as they were, into the church of Christ. Accordingly, as he proceeds in his Argument³⁵, the Gospel, or good news, *ευαγγελιον*, sent to the Gentiles, is expressly contrasted with that sent to the Jews.

This seems also to be the sense of the word in another passage³⁶, where what he calls *το ευαγγελιον μυσ*, he describes as *μυσηριον αιωνιους σεσιγημενον*, *kept secret for ages*, but now made known to all nations for the obedience of the faith. For, in this manner, he oftener than once speaks of the call of the Gentiles. In all such passages, it is better to retain the general term *good news* in the version. This appellation is, in some respect, evidently applicable to them all, whereas the term *Gospel* is never thus understood in our language.

³⁵ Gal. ii. 7.³⁶ Rom. xvi. 25.

PART III.

OF THE PHRASE ἡ καινη διαθηκη.

ANOTHER title, by which the religious institution of Jesus Christ is sometimes denominated, is ἡ καινη διαθηκη, which is almost always, in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, rendered by our translators *the New Testament*. Yet the word διαθηκη by itself is, except in a very few places, always there rendered not *Testament*, but *Covenant*. It is the Greek word whereby the Seventy have uniformly translated the Hebrew ברית *berith*, which our translators in the Old Testament have invariably rendered *Covenant*. That the Hebrew term corresponds much better to the English word *Covenant*, though not in every case perfectly equivalent, than to *Testament*, there can be no question: at the same time it must be owned that the word διαθηκη, in classical use, is more frequently rendered *Testament*. The proper Greek word for *Covenant* is συνθηκη, which is not found in the New Testament, and occurs only thrice in the Septuagint. It is never there employed for rendering the Hebrew *berith*, though, in one place, it is substituted for a term nearly synonymous. That the scriptural sense of the word διαθηκη is more fitly expressed by our term

Covenant, will not be doubted by any body who considers the constant application of the Hebrew word so rendered in the Old Testament, and of the Greek word, in most places at least, where it is used in the New. What has led translators, ancient and modern, to render it *Testament*, is, I imagine, the manner wherein the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews argues³⁷, in allusion to the classical acceptation of the term. But however much it was necessary to give a different turn to the expression in that passage, in order to make the author's argument as intelligible to the English, as it is in the original to the Greek, reader; this was not a sufficient reason for giving a version to the word, in other places; that neither suits the context, nor is conformable to the established use of the term, in the sacred writings.

§ 2. THE term *New* is added to distinguish it from the *Old Covenant*, that is, the dispensation of Moses. I cannot help observing by the way, that often the language of theological systems, so far from assisting us to understand the language of holy writ, tends rather to mislead us. The two Covenants are always in Scripture the two dispensations, or religious institutions; that under Moses is the *Old*, that under the Messiah is the *New*. I do not deny that in the latitude wherein the term is used in holy writ, the command under the sanction of death which God gave to Adam in paradise, may, like the ordinance of circum-

³⁷ ix. 16, 17.

cision, with sufficient propriety be termed a *Covenant*; but it is pertinent to observe that it is never so denominated in Scripture; and that, when mention is made in the Epistles, of the two Covenants, the *Old* and the *New*, or the first and the second (for there are two so called by way of eminence,) there appears no reference to any thing that related to Adam. In all such places, Moses and Jesus are contrasted, the Jewish economy and the Christian, Mount Sinai in Arabia, whence the law was promulged, and Mount Sion in Jerusalem, where the Gospel was first published.

§ 3. It is proper to observe further that, from signifying the two religious dispensations, they came soon to denote the books, wherein what related to these dispensations was contained; the sacred writings of the Jews being called *ἡ παλαια διαθηκη*, and the writings superadded by the Apostles and Evangelists, *ἡ καινη διαθηκη*. We have one example in Scripture, of this use of the former appellation. The Apostle says³⁸, speaking of his countrymen, *Until this day remaineth the veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, επι τη αναγνωσει της παλαιας διαθηκης*. The word in this application is always rendered in our language *Testament*. We have in this followed the Vulgate, as most modern translators also have done. In the Geneva French, the word is rendered both ways in the title, that the one may

³⁸ 2 Cor. iii. 14.

serve for explaining the other, *Le nouveau Testament*, c'est a dire *La nouvelle alliance*, &c. in which they copied Beza, who says, *Testamentum novum*, sive *Fædus novum*. That the second rendering of the word is the better version, is unquestionable ; but the title appropriated by custom to a particular book, is on the same footing with a proper name, which is hardly considered as a subject for criticism. Thus we call Cæsar's Diary, *Cæsar's Commentaries*, from their Latin name, though very different in meaning from the English word.

PART IV.

OF THE NAME *ὁ Χριστός*.

THE only other term necessary to be examined here, is *ὁ Χριστός*, the Messiah, or *the Christ* ; in English rendered, according to the etymology of the word, *the anointed* ; for so both the Hebrew *משיח*, *Meschiach*, and the Greek *Χριστός* signify ; and from the sound of these are formed our names *Messiah* and *Christ*. What first gave rise to the term, was the ceremony of anointing, by which the kings and the high-priests of God's people, and sometimes the Prophets⁵⁹, were consecrated

⁵⁹ 1 Kings, xix. 16.

and admitted to the exercise of their holy functions ; for all these functions were accounted holy among the Israelites. As this consecration was considered as adding a sacredness to their persons, it served as a guard against violence from the respect had to religion. Its efficacy this way was remarkably exemplified in David, who acknowledges that, when he had it in his power to avenge himself of Saul his enemy who sought his life, he was, principally by this consideration, restrained from killing him. *The Lord forbid*⁴⁰, said he, *that I should do this thing unto my master, the Lord's anointed, to stretch forth mine hand against him, seeing he is the anointed of the Lord.* The word here translated *anointed* is, as in other places, in Hebrew *Messiah*, and in the Greek of the Seventy, *Christ*. It was a term, therefore, in its original use, applicable to all the succession of kings and high-priests, good and bad, of the people of Israel.

§ 2. BUT, as the king and the high-priest were the heads of the whole nation, the one in civil, the other in religious matters, the term *anointed*, that is *Messiah* or *Christ*, might, not improbably, serve, by a figure, to denote the head, chief, or principal of any class or people. So thinks the learned Grotius. Thus the high-priest is sometimes distinguished from ordinary priests by the title *the anointed priest* ; in the Septuagint $\delta \text{ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός}$; though this, I own, is not a proof

⁴⁰ 1 Sam. xxiv. 6.

of the point, since he was literally so distinguished from the rest⁴¹. But that the word is sometimes applied, when, in the literal sense, no anointing had been used, cannot be questioned. In this way it is applied to Cyrus the Persian monarch by the Prophet Isaiah⁴², *Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus*; yet Houbigant, differing from his usual manner, renders the words, *de uncto suo Cyro*. But whether the import of this expression be, that Cyrus was a chief among kings, a most eminent sovereign, as Grotius seems to imagine, or that he was selected of God for the restoration of Judah, and the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem, the only temple dedicated to the true God, may be made a question. For my part, I am inclinable to think that it is rather this latter interpretation which conveys the Prophet's idea, and the meaning intended by the Spirit of God. And to this interpretation the context entirely agrees. The word was also employed to denote those specially favoured of God, as were the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; concerning whom he is represented by the Psalmist⁴³, as having said, *Touch not mine anointed*. The word is in the plural number, *των χριστων μου*, in the Vulgate *Christos meos*, which, in our idiom,

⁴¹ The sons of Aaron were indeed all anointed, in their father's lifetime, by the express command of God; but it does not appear, that this practice descended to other ordinary priests.

⁴² Is. xlv. 1.

⁴³ Psal. cv. 15. 1 Chr. xvi. 22.

is not distinguished from the singular. Now there is no ground from Scripture to believe that any of them was in the literal sense anointed.

§ 3. BUT the most eminent use and application of the word is when it is employed as the title of that sublime Personage typified and predicted from the beginning, who was to prove, in the most exalted sense, the Redeemer and Lord of God's people. He is spoken of by the Prophets, under several characters, and, amongst others, under this of *God's anointed*, the Messiah, or the Christ. Those of the Prophets, who seem more especially to have appropriated this title, formerly more common, to the Mediator of the New Covenant, were the royal Prophet David⁴⁴, Isaiah⁴⁵, and Daniel⁴⁶. The first represents him as anointed of God, King of God's heritage, the second as set apart and consecrated to be the Messenger of good tidings to the inhabitants of the earth, the third as appointed to make expiation for the sins of the people.

§ 4. IT deserves to be remarked that, in the English translation of the Old Testament, the word is always rendered *anointed*, to whomsoever applied, except in the two verses of Daniel quoted in the margin, where it is translated *Messiah*. In

⁴⁴ Psal. ii. 2.⁴⁵ Isaiah, lxi. 1, &c.⁴⁶ Dan. ix. 25, 26.

the New Testament, the corresponding Greek word is always rendered *Christ*, and commonly without the article. In this our interpreters have been so uniform, that they have even employed the word *Christ*, where the passage is a quotation and literal translation from the Old Testament, in which the Hebrew word, though perfectly equivalent, had been by themselves rendered *anointed*. Thus ⁴⁷, *the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ, κατα τῆς Χριστῶς αὐτοῦ*. The words are quoted from the second Psalm, where they had said, *against his anointed*. The change here is the more remarkable, as there is a plain reference to the meaning of the word in the very next sentence: *For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, οὐκ ἐχθίστας, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Israel, were gathered together.*

§ 5. IN the Vulgate, in all the places of the Old Testament above referred to, it is translated *Christus*. So it is also in Houbigant, except where it is applied to Cyrus, as mentioned § 2. Whereas, in regard to Cyrus, it is in the Vulgate, *Hæc dicit Dominus Christo meo Cyro*. The same appellation is also given to King Saul, *Dixitque David ad viros suos, Propitius sit mihi Dominus, ne faciam hanc rem domino meo, Christo Domini, ut mittam manum meam in eum, quia Christus*

⁴⁷ Acts, iv. 26, 27.

Domini est. In the Psalms, *Nolite tangere Christos meos*, and *adversus Dominum et adversus Christum ejus*. In Daniel also the word is in the same way rendered. Here indeed, and in the last-mentioned passage from the Psalms, as no Christian can well doubt the reference to the Messiah, there is not so great an appearance of impropriety; yet, when applied to the high-priest, they have not said *christus*, but *unctus*, giving the import of the word as it was literally applicable to him. Otherwise the term *Christus* might have been used, at least, as properly of the high-priest, who was, in one respect, a figure of our Lord, as either of a heathen prince, or even of a bad king of Israel. All the other Latin translators, except *Leo de Juda*, if I remember right, use *unctus*, not only in speaking of the priest, but also in relation to Cyrus and Saul; and wherever they have not observed a direct reference to the Lord Jesus. *Leo*, in the passage above quoted from Samuel, uses both words, *messias* and *unctus*, in relation to Saul, where he probably introduces the latter word for explaining the former. *Servet me Dominus, ne rem istam designem contra dominum meum messiam Domini, ut scilicet inferam ei manum; est enim unctus Domini.* To Cyrus also he applies the word *messias*. In Daniel, *Leo*, *Castalio*, and *Houbigant*, all use the word *messias*: *Junius* chooses *christus* with the Vulgate, both there and in the second Psalm, in which last mentioned place *Leo* also uses *christus*. About other modern translations it is not necessary here to inquire. It is sufficient to observe that, at the time of

our Lord's appearing, and for many years before, the term was understood to denote the great Deliverer and Prince whom God, by his prophets, had promised to send, for the comfort and redemption of his people.

§ 6. LET us now consider a little the use of the term in the New Testament. If we were to judge by the common version, or even by most versions into modern tongues, we should consider the word as rather a proper name than an appellative, or name of office, and should think of it only as a surname given to our Lord. Our translators have contributed greatly to this mistake, by very seldom prefixing the article before *Christ*, though it is rarely wanting in the original. The word *Christ* was at first as much an appellative as the word *baptist* was, and the one was as regularly accompanied with the article as the other. Yet our translators, who always say *the baptist*, have, one would think, studiously avoided saying *the Christ*. This may appear to superficial readers an inconsiderable difference; but the addition of the article will be found, when attended to, of real consequence for conveying the meaning in English, with the same perspicuity and propriety with which it is conveyed in Greek. So much virtue there is in the article, which, in our idiom, is never prefixed to the name of a man, though it is invariably prefixed to the name of office, unless where some pronoun, or appropriating expression, renders it unnecessary; that, without it, the

sense is always darkened, and sometimes marred. Thus, in such expressions as these, *This Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ*⁴⁸ : *Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ*⁴⁹ : *Showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ*⁵⁰ : the unlearned reader forms no distinct apprehension, as the common application of the words leads him uniformly to consider Jesus and Christ, as no other than the name and surname of the same person. It would have conveyed to such a reader precisely the same meaning to have said, *Paul testified to the Jews that Christ was Jesus* ; and so of the rest. The article alone, therefore, in such cases, adds considerable light to the expression ; yet no more than what the words of the historian manifestly convey to every reader who understands his language. It should be, therefore, *Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ*, or the Messiah, &c. Many other examples might be brought to the same purpose ; but these are sufficient.

§ 7. BUT it may be asked, Is the word *Christ* then never to be understood in the New Testament as a proper name ; but always as having a direct reference to the office or dignity ? I answer that, without question, this word, though originally an appellative, came at length, from the frequency of application to one individual, and only to one, to supply the place of a proper name.

⁴⁸ Acts, xvii. 3.⁴⁹ xviii. 5.⁵⁰ 28

What would contribute to hasten this effect, was the commonness of the name *Jesus* among the Jews at that time, which rendered an addition necessary for distinguishing the person. The remark of Grotius is not without foundation, that, in process of time the name *Jesus* was very much dropped, and *Christ*, which had never been used before as the proper name of any person, and was, for that very reason, a better distinction, was substituted for it; insomuch, that, among the heathen, our Lord came to be more known by the latter, than the former. This use seems to have begun soon after his ascension. In his lifetime, it does not appear that the word was ever used in this manner; nay, the contrary is evident from several passages of the Gospels. But the Evangelists wrote some years after the period above mentioned, and therefore, the more perfectly to notify the subject of their history, they adopted the practice common among Christians at that time, which was to employ the word as a surname for the sake of distinction. This was especially proper in the beginning of their narrative, for ascertaining the person whose history they were to write. Thus Matthew begins, *The lineage of Jesus Christ*⁵¹; and a little after⁵², *Now the birth of Jesus Christ happened thus*. Mark, in like manner⁵³, *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ*. In all the three places it is *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *Jesus Christ*, not *Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *Jesus the Christ*, or the Messiah.

⁵¹ i. 1.⁵² 18.⁵³ i. 1.

Matthew and Mark, as was just now observed, name him so, in introducing their Gospels ; but it deserves to be remarked that they do not afterwards, in their history, either name him so themselves, or mention this name as given him by any of his cotemporaries : nay, the very profession of Peter, and the doubts raised by his enemies, in regard to his being *ὁ χριστος*, *the Messiah*, or *the Christ*, and his never being named familiarly, either by them or by others, during that period, *Ἰησους Χριστος*, but simply *Ἰησους* or *ὁ Ἰησους*, which occurs in the four Gospels upwards of five hundred times, put it beyond doubt, that the word was never applied to him as a proper name, whilst he remained on this earth. It was at that time always understood as the denomination of the dignity or office to which some believed him entitled, others disbelieved, and many doubted. The names used both by Matthew and by Mark, in the beginning of their Gospels, and by John, in the introductory part of his⁵⁴, for Luke does not adopt this manner ; show only the usage which obtained at the time when they wrote, but not when their Lord was living upon the earth. In the last of the four Gospels, he is, in one place⁵⁵, represented, as calling himself Jesus Christ, in an address to God ; but this is so singular, that I cannot help suspecting an accidental omission of the article ; and that the clause must have stood originally *ὃν απεσειλας Ἰησυν τον χριστον*, *Jesus the Messiah whom thou*

⁵⁴ i. 17.

⁵⁵ John, xvii. 3.

hast sent. But, whatever be in this, we are warranted to conclude, from the uniform tenour of all the Gospels, that *χριστος*, in this passage, must be understood as the name of his office. Now, for the very same reason for which our translators have rendered *ὁ Βαπτιστης*, uniformly *the baptist*, with the article, they ought to have rendered *ὁ χριστος*, *the Christ*, or *the Messiah*, with the article. By not doing it, they have thrown much obscurity on some passages, and weakened others.

§ 8. THOUGH, in the Epistles, it may be sometimes difficult, but is seldom of consequence, to determine whether *Χριστος* be an appellative or a proper name, there is rarely in the Gospels, with which I am here more immediately concerned, any difficulty that can retard an attentive and judicious critic. Such will be sensible, that whatever was the case afterwards, the word *Christ*, during the period comprehended in the Gospel history, was employed solely to express the office or dignity wherewith he was invested, as the Apostle of God, for the redemption of the world. Accordingly, when it is used in the Gospels, the stress of the sentence lies commonly on the signification of that word. Peter in his solemn confession, says⁵⁶, *We believe and are sure that thou art ὁ Χριστος the Christ the Messiah, the Son of the living God.* Here the substance of his declared belief lies much in the import of

⁵⁶ John, vi. 69.

this term. Our translators have considered this as so evident that, in the parallel passages in other Gospels, they have departed from their ordinary practice, and rendered it *the Christ*, and in this passage, less properly, *that Christ*. In other places where propriety equally required the article, they have not given it.

Of several which might be quoted, I shall mention only one example in the question put by Jesus to the Pharisees: ⁵⁷ *Τι ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ*, which our translators render, *What think ye of Christ?* The word used in this manner, without any article definite or indefinite, or any other term to ascertain the meaning, must, in our idiom, be a proper name; and, as here proposed by Jesus, can be understood no otherways by an unlearned reader than as intended for drawing forth their sentiments concerning himself. To such the question must appear identical with *What think ye of Jesus?* A name of office is never used in so indistinct a manner. For example, we may say indefinitely, *What think ye of a king?* or definitely, *What think ye of the king?* but never, *What think ye of king?* unless we speak of one whose name is *King*. Yet an appellative may be used without an article when the name is subjoined, because this serves equally with the article to ascertain the meaning, as thus, *What think ye of king Solomon?* In the place above quoted, there was therefore the strongest

⁵⁷ Matth. xxii. 42.

reason for following more closely the original, as it was evidently our Lord's purpose to draw forth their sentiments, not concerning himself, the individual who put the question to them, and whom he knew they considered as an impostor, but, in general, concerning the quality of that Personage whom, under the title of Messiah, they themselves expected.

§ 9. ONE mark of distinction, therefore, whereby the title *Χριστος* may be discriminated from the name, is its being attended with the article. I do not mention this, however, as holding invariably, but very generally. When the word is in the vocative, by the idiom of the language, there can be no article; in that case, therefore, we must be directed solely by the sense. Thus, in *προφητευσον ἡμιν, Χρισε* ⁵⁸, this term must mean *Messiah*, as the intended ridicule is entirely founded on their ascribing that character to one in his wretched circumstances. Another exception is, when it is joined to some other title, as *Χριστος Κυριος* ⁵⁹, *Χριστος βασιλευς* ⁶⁰; and sometimes, but more rarely, when construed with a pronoun, as *εαν τις αυτον ομολογηση χρισον* ⁶¹, where the sense renders the meaning indubitable. In a few places in regard to this, as well as to other terms, there is an ellipsis of the article, where the most common usage would require it. Of this *οτι χρισε εσε* ⁶², is an instance.

⁵⁸ Matth. xxvi. 68.⁵⁹ Luke, ii. 11.⁶⁰ xxiii. 2.⁶¹ John, ix. 22.⁶² Mark, ix. 41.

I know it may be objected to the article as a criterion, that in Greek it is not unusual to prefix it to the proper names of persons. Accordingly, in naming our Lord, *Ιησους* and *ὁ Ιησους* are used indifferently. For this reason, I do not lay much stress on this distinction, unless it be confirmed by the connection. In the Epistles, it is plain, that the term is used familiarly as a proper name, and consequently when alone, and not appearing from the context to be emphatical, may be properly rendered as a name, whether it have the article or not. But when it immediately follows *Ιησους*, the article not intervening, it can hardly be interpreted otherwise. Let it be observed that, in scriptural use, when a person has two names, the article, if used at all, is prefixed to the first name, and never inserted between them, unless when some other word, as *λεγομενος*, is added by way of explanation. Thus it is *Πορκιος Φησος*, *Σεργιος Παυλος*, *Ιουδας Ισκαριωτης*, *Ποντιος Πιλατος*, and *Σιμων Ηετρος*. Indeed, where a person is distinguished by adding an epithet rather than a surname, denoting the place of his birth, or of his residence, the article is constantly prefixed to the adjective. Thus it is always *Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνη*, literally *Mary the Magdalene*, that is, *of Magdala*, a city on the lake of Gennesaret; and *Ιησους ὁ Ναζαραιος* *Jesus the Nazarene*, or *of Nazareth*.

When the article, therefore, is inserted between the words *Ιησους* and *Χριστος*, there is reason to consider the latter as used emphatically, and pointing directly to his office. In many places in the

Epistles, perhaps in a very few in the Gospels, it may be regarded as a matter of indifference, in which of the two ways the term is translated. Thus, in the first chapter of Matthew⁶³, *Ἰησους, ὁ λεγομενος Χριστος*, may be either, *Jesus, who is called Christ*, that being a surname which, when Matthew wrote, was frequently given him, or *Jesus who is called* (that is, *accounted*) *Messiah*. I have, in my version, preferred the second interpretation; as, in the verse immediately following, we cannot understand otherwise the words *ἕως τῆς χριστος*, with the article, and without the name *Ἰησους* prefixed. If so, *ὁ λεγομενος χριστος* is mentioned to prepare us for this application of the title. Besides, the same phrase occurs again in this Gospel⁶⁴, as used by Pilate at a time when it was never applied to our Lord but by his followers, and that solely as the denomination of his office. So much for the method whereby we may discover when this word is emphatical, and when it is merely a surname.

§ 10. IT is proper now to inquire, in the last place, which of the three terms, *Messiah*, *Christ*, or *Anointed*, is the most proper to be applied in an English version. The word *Anointed* is indeed an English word, and is, besides, in respect of the idea it conveys, expressive of the etymological import of the Hebrew and Greek terms. But, notwithstanding these advantages, it is not

63 16.

64 xxvii. 17. 22.

so proper in this case for being used in a version. For first, the original term had early been employed, as we have seen, without any regard to the literal signification; and, in the ordinary application of it, in our Lord's time, little or no attention seems to have been given to the circumstance of unction, which gave rise to the name. Though the word *Anointed*, therefore, expresses the primitive import of the Hebrew name, it does not convey the meaning in which it was then universally understood. It was considered solely as the well-known title of an extraordinary office, to which there was nothing similar, amongst any other people. The original name, therefore, agreeably to what was concluded in a former discourse⁶⁵, ought to be retained. Secondly, it deserves some notice, that the word, both in Hebrew and in Greek, is a substantive, and therefore, in point of form, well adapted for a name of office, being susceptible of the same variety, in number and mode of construction with other substantives; the English word *Anointed* is a participle and indeclinable, and so far from being adapted for the name of an office, that it is grammatically no more than the attributive of some name, either expressed or understood.

§ 11. As to the other two words, *Messiah* and *Christ*, it may be thought a matter of indifference which of them should be preferred. The following are the reasons which have determined me to

⁶⁵ Diss. II. Part I. § 5.

give the preference to the former. First, our Lord's own ministry was only amongst his countrymen the Jews, to whom the title of *Messiah* was familiar. With them, wheresoever dispersed, it is considered as the title of that dignity to this day, and is accordingly naturalized in every language that they speak. We never hear of the *Jewish Christ*, it is always the *Jewish Messiah*. When the English translators found it convenient, in translating Daniel, to adopt a term more appropriated than the general word *anointed*, they chose the Hebrew term *Messiah*, in preference to the Greek; and it is surely proper, when the meaning of a word in the New Testament is manifestly the same, to conform, as much as possible, to the language of the Old. That the word *Messiah* was constantly used in Palestine, in our Lord's time, is evident from the two passages in the Gospel of John⁶⁶, where, after mentioning it as the title in current use, both with Jews, and with Samaritans, he adds the explanation in Greek. Secondly, *Messiah* is, even in English use, much more familiar, as the name of the office, than the term *Christ*, which is now universally understood as a proper name of our Saviour. The word *Messiah*, on the contrary, is never employed, and consequently never understood, as a proper name. It is invariably a name of office: and even this circumstance, however slight it may appear, has a considerable influence on perspicuity.

⁶⁶ i. 42. iv. 25.

§ 12. I SHALL only add here, before I conclude this subject, that the word *χρῖστος* is frequently used by Paul as a trope, denoting sometimes the Christian spirit and temper, as when he says, *My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you*⁶⁷. Sometimes the Christian doctrine, *But ye have not so learned Christ*⁶⁸. And in one place at least, the Christian church, *For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ*⁶⁹. In these cases it is better to retain the name *Christ*, as used hitherto in the version.

§ 13. SOME have thought that the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, *the son of man*, which our Lord always uses when he speaks of himself in the third person, is also a title which was then understood to denote the Messiah. But of this there does not appear sufficient evidence. The only passage of moment that is pleaded in support of it, is from the Prophet Daniel, who says, that he saw in the night visions, *one like the son of man come, with the clouds of heaven, to the ancient of days, and that there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom*⁷⁰. There can be no reasonable doubt, from the description given, that the Messiah is meant. But this is not notified by any of the

⁶⁷ Gal. iv. 19.

⁶⁸ Eph. iv. 20.

⁶⁹ 1 Cor. xii. 12.

⁷⁰ Dan. vii. 13, 14.

terms or phrases taken separately ; it is the result of the whole. Nothing appears to be pointed out by this single circumstance, *one like the son of man*, or *like a son of man* (as it ought to have been rendered, neither term being in *statu emphatico*, which in Chaldee supplies the article,) but that he would be a human, not an angelical, or any other kind of being : for, in the oriental idiom, *son of man* and *man*, are terms equivalent.

The four monarchies which were to precede that of the Messiah, the Prophet had, in the foregoing part of the chapter, described under the figure of certain beasts, as emblems severally of the predominant character of each ; the first under the figure of a lion, the second under that of a bear, the third of a leopard, and the fourth of a monster more terrible than any of these. This kingdom, which God himself was to erect, is contradistinguished to all the rest, by the figure of a man, in order to denote, that whereas violence, in some shape or other, would be the principal means by which those merely secular kingdoms would be established, and terror the principal motive by which submission would be enforced, it would be quite otherwise in that spiritual kingdom to be erected by the ancient of days, wherein every thing would be suited to man's rational and moral nature ; affection would be the prevailing motive to obedience, and persuasion the means of producing it ; or, to use the Scripture expression, we should be drawn *with cords of a man*, *with bands of love*.

Had the Prophet used *man* instead of *son of man*, could one have concluded, that the word *man* was intended as a distinguishing title of the Messiah? It will hardly be pretended. Yet the argument would have been the same; for the terms are synonymous.

There are two phrases by which this may be expressed in the Hebrew, בן אדם *ben adam*, and בן איש *ben ish*. When these two are contrasted to each other, the former denotes one of low degree, the latter one of superior rank. Thus *bene adam ubene ish* are in the Psalms⁷¹ rightly rendered in the common version *low and high*. The first *bene adam* is, in the Septuagint, translated γηγενεις, in the Vulgate, *terrigenæ*, earth-born, or sons of earth, in allusion to the derivation of the word *adam*, man, from a word signifying ground or *earth*. The same *ben adam*, is the common appellation by which God addresses the Prophet Ezekiel, which is rendered by the Seventy *υιε ανθρωπου*, and frequently occurs in that Book. *The son of man*, therefore, was an humble title, in which nothing was claimed, but what was enjoyed in common with all mankind. In the Syriac version of the New Testament, it often occurs, where the term in the Greek is simply *ανθρωπος*, *man*.

That it was never understood by the people in our Lord's time, as a title of the Messiah, or even a title of particular dignity, is manifest from several considerations. In the first place, though Jesus

⁷¹ Psal. xlix. 2.

commonly takes it to himself, it is never given him by the Evangelists, in speaking of him. He is never addressed with this title by others, whether disciples or strangers. Several honourable appellations were given him, by those who applied for relief, as, *κυριε, διδασκαλε*, *rabbi*; sometimes he is addressed *son of David*, sometimes *son of God*, and on one occasion he is called *he who cometh in the name of the Lord*. The two last titles may reasonably be supposed to imply an acknowledgment of him as Messiah. Now, if the title *son of man* had been thought, even in any degree, respectful from others, we should certainly have had some examples of it, in his lifetime. Further, our Lord was in the practice of denominating himself in this manner, at the very time that he prohibited his disciples from acquainting any man that he was the Messiah. What purpose could this prohibition have answered, if the title he commonly assumed, in the hearing of every body, was understood to be of the same import? It is urged further, that this phrase is used in the Apocalypse⁷², in describing the vision which the Apostle had of his Master. The answer is the same with that given to the argument founded on Daniel's vision. First, the phrase is not entirely the same with that by which Jesus distinguishes himself in the Gospel. Our Lord calls himself *ο υιος του ανθρωπου*, *the son of man*; John says, *ομοιον υιω ανθρωπου*, without any article, *one like a son of man*, that is,

⁷² Rev. i. 13.

in the human form. It is indeed evident that he is speaking of Jesus Christ; but this is what we gather from the whole description and context, and not from this circumstance alone.

§ 14. BUT, whatever be in this, there are several titles which, in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, are peculiarly applied to our Lord, though they do not often occur. I have already mentioned *ὁ ἐρχομενος ἐν ὀνοματι κυριου*, and *ὁ υἱος Δαβιδ*. Add to these *ὁ ἅγιος του Θεου*, *the saint, or the holy one of God*, *ὁ ἐκλεκτος του Θεου*, *the elect or the chosen one of God*, both expressions borrowed from the Prophets. Now, though these terms are in the plural number susceptible of an application to others, both angels and men; they are, in the New Testament, when in the singular number, and accompanied with the article, evidently appropriated to the Messiah.

299

= Oct 25 1852

March 26 1851

18y. 5m. 10.

Dissertation the Sixth.

INQUIRY INTO THE DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPORT OF
SOME WORDS COMMONLY THOUGHT SYNONYMOUS.

SEVERAL words in the New Testament considered by our translators as synonymous, and commonly rendered by the same English word, are not really synonymous, though their significations may have an affinity, and though sometimes they may be used indiscriminately. I shall exemplify this remark in a few instances of words which occur in the Gospels.

PART I.

Διαβολος, Δαιμων, AND Δαιμονιον.

THE first of this kind, on which I intend to make some observations, are *διαβολος*, *δαιμων*, and *δαιμονιον*, all rendered in the common translation almost invariably *devil*. The word *διαβολος*, in its ordinary acceptation, signifies *calumniator*,

traducer, false accuser, from the verb *διαβαλλειν*, to calumniate, &c. Though the word is sometimes, both in the Old Testament and in the New, applied to men and women of this character, it is, by way of eminence, employed to denote that apostate angel, who is exhibited to us, particularly in the New Testament, as the great enemy of God and man. In the two first chapters of Job, it is the word in the Septuagint, by which the Hebrew שָׂטָן *Satan* or *adversary* is translated. Indeed the Hebrew word in this application, as well as the Greek, has been naturalized in most modern languages. Thus we say indifferently *the devil* or *Satan*; only the latter has more the appearance of a proper name, as it is not attended with the article. There is this difference between the import of such terms, as occurring in their native tongues, and as modernized in translations. In the former they always retain somewhat of their primitive meaning, and, beside indicating a particular being, or class of beings, they are of the nature of appellatives, and mark a special character or note of distinction in such beings. Whereas, when thus Latinized or Englished, they answer solely the first of these uses, as they come nearer the nature of proper names. This remark extends to all such words, as *cherub, seraph, angel, apostle, evangelist, messiah*.

§ 2. *Διαβολος*, I observed, is sometimes applied to human beings. But nothing is easier than to distinguish this application from the more frequent application to the arch-apostate. One mark of

distinction is that, in this last use of the term, it is never found in the plural. When the plural is used, the context always shows that it is human beings, and not fallen angels, that are spoken of. It occurs in the plural only thrice, and only in Paul's Epistles. *Γυναικας*, says he¹, *ὡσαντως σεμνας, μη διαβολους*, *Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers*. In scriptural use the word may be either masculine or feminine. Again, speaking of the bad men who would appear in the last times, he says², amongst other things, that they will be *αστοργοι, ασπονδοι, διαβολοι*, in the common translation, *without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers*. Once more³, *Πρεσβυτιδας ὡσαντως εν καταστηματι ιεροπρεπεις, μη διαβολους*. *The aged women likewise, that they be in behaviour as becometh holiness, not false accusers*. Another criterion, whereby the application of this word to the prince of darkness may be discovered, is its being attended with the article. The term almost invariably is *ὁ διαβολος*. I say *almost*, because there are a few exceptions.

§ 3. It may not be amiss, ere we proceed, to specify the exceptions, that we may discover whether there be any thing in the construction that supplies the place of the article, or at least makes that it may be more easily dispensed with. Paul, addressing himself to Elymas the sorcerer, who endeavoured to turn away the proconsul Ser-

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 11.² 2 Tim. iii. 3.³ Tit. ii. 3.

gius Paulus from the faith, says⁴, *O full of all subtilty, thou child of the devil, ῡιε διαβολοῡ.* There can be no doubt that the Apostle here means the evil spirit, agreeably to the idiom of Scripture, where a good man is called a child of God, and a bad man a child of the devil. *Ye are of your father the devil*, said our Lord to the Pharisees⁵. As to the example from the Acts, all I can say is, that in an address of this form, where a vocative is immediately followed by the genitive of the word construed with it, the connection is conceived to be so close as to render the omission of the article more natural than in other cases. This holds especially when, as in the present instance, the address must have been accompanied with some emotion and vehemence in the speaker. I know not whether *ὁ αντιδικος ῡμων διαβολος*⁶, *your adversary the devil*, ought to be considered as an example. There being here two appellatives, the article prefixed to the first, may be regarded as common, though I own it is more usual, in such cases, for the greater emphasis, to repeat it. In the word *ὁς ε̄στι διαβολος και σατανας*⁷, *who is the devil and satan*; as the sole view is to mention the names whereby the malignant spirit is distinguished, we can hardly call this instance an exception. Now these are all the examples, I can find in which the word, though used indefinitely, or without the article, evidently denotes our spiritual and ancient enemy. The examples in

⁴ Acts, xiii. 10.

⁵ John, viii. 44.

⁶ 1 Pet. v. 8.

⁷ Rev. xx. 2.

which it occurs in this sense, with the article, it were tedious to enumerate.

§ 4. THERE is only one place, beside those above mentioned, where the word is found without the article, and, as it is intended to express a human character, though a very bad one, ought not, I think, to have been rendered *devil*. The words are, *Jesus answered, Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?* ἐξ υμῶν εἰς διαβολος εστι⁸. My reasons for not translating it *devil* in this place are; first, the word is strictly and originally an appellative, denoting a certain bad quality, and though commonly applied to one particular being, yet naturally applicable to any kind of being susceptible of moral character; secondly, as the term in its appropriation to the arch-rebel, always denotes one individual, the term *a devil* is not agreeable to Scripture style, insomuch that I am inclined to think, that if our Lord's intention had been to use, by an antonomasia, the distinguishing name of the evil spirit, in order to express more strongly the sameness of character in both, he would have said ὁ διαβολος, one of you is the *devil*, this being the only way whereby that evil spirit is discriminated. The words *αντιδικος* adversary, *πειραζων* tempter with the article, are also used by way of eminence, though not so frequently, to express the same malignant being; yet, when either of these occurs without the article, applied to a man as an

⁸ John, vi. 70.

adversary or a tempter, we do not suppose any allusion to the devil. The case would be different, if one were denominated ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αντιδικος, *the tempter, the adversary*.

There is not any epithet (for διαβολος is no more than an epithet) by which the same spirit is oftener distinguished, than by that of ὁ πονηρος, *the evil one*. Now, when a man is called simply πονηρος, without the article, no more is understood to be implied than that he is a bad man. But if the expression were ὁ πονηρος, unless used to distinguish a bad from a good man of the same name, we should consider it as equivalent to the devil, or *the evil one*. Even in metaphorical appellations, if a man were denominated *a dragon* or *a serpent*, we should go no farther for the import of the metaphor, than to the nature of the animal so called: but if he were termed *the dragon* or *the old serpent*, this would immediately suggest to us, that it was the intention of the speaker to represent the character as the same with that of the seducer of our first parents. The unlearned English reader will object, Where is the impropriety in speaking of *a devil*? Is any thing more common in the New Testament? How often is there mention of persons possessed with *a devil*? We hear too of numbers of them. Out of Mary Magdalene went seven; and out of the furious man who made the sepulchres his residence, a legion. The Greek student needs not be informed that, in none of those places, is the term διαβολος, but δαιμων or δαιμονιον. Nor can any thing be clearer from Scripture than that, though the *demons*

are innumerable, there is but one *devil* in the universe. Besides, if we must suppose that this word, when applied to human creatures, bears, at the same time, an allusion to the evil spirit; there is the same reason for rendering it devils, in the three passages lately quoted from Paul: for, wherever the indefinite use is proper in the singular, there can be no impropriety in the use of the plural. Both equally suppose that there may be many of the sort. Now, it is plain that those passages would lose greatly, by such an alteration. Instead of pointing, according to the manifest scope of the place, to a particular bad quality to be avoided, or, a vice whereby certain dangerous persons would be distinguished, it could only serve as a vague expression of what is bad in general, and so would convey little or no instruction.

§ 5. THE only plea I know, in favour of the common translation of the passage is, that, by the help of the trope *antonomasia* (for devil in our language has much the force of a proper name,) the expression has more strength and animation, than a mere appellative could give it. But that the expression is more animated, is so far from being an argument in its favour, that it is, in my judgment, the contrary. It savours more of the human spirit than of the divine, more of the translator than of the author. We are inclinable to put that expression into an author's mouth, which we should, on such an occasion, have chosen ourselves. When affected with anger or resentment,

we always desert the proper terms, for those tropes which will convey our sentiment with most asperity. This is not the manner of our Lord, especially in cases wherein he himself is the direct object of either injury or insult. Apposite thoughts, clothed in the plainest expressions, are much more characteristic of his manner. When there appears severity in what he says, it will be found to arise from the truth and pertinency of the thought, and not from a curious selection of cutting and reproachful words. This would be but ill adapted to the patience, the meekness, and the humility, of his character; not to mention that it would be little of a piece with the account given of the rest of his sufferings.

I know it may be objected, that the rebuke given to Peter⁹, *Get thee behind me, Satan*, is conceived in terms as harsh, though the provocation was far from being equal. The answer is much the same in regard to both. Satan, though conceived by us as a proper name, was an appellative in the language spoken by our Lord; for, from the Hebrew it passed into the Syriac, and signified no more than adversary or opponent. It is naturally just as applicable to human, as to spiritual agents, and is, in the Old Testament, often so applied.

§ 6. I ACKNOWLEDGE that the word *διαβολος*, in the case under examination, is to be understood as used in the same latitude with the Hebrew *Satan*.

⁹ Matth. xvi. 23.

which, though commonly interpreted by the Seventy *διαβολος*, is sometimes rendered *επιβουλος*, *insidiator*, and may be here fitly translated into English, either *spy* or *informer*. The Scribes and Pharisees, in consequence of their knowledge of the opposition between our Lord's doctrine and theirs, had conceived an envy of him, which settled into malice and hatred, insomuch that they needed no accuser. But though Judas did not properly accuse his master to them as a criminal, the purpose which he engaged to the Scribes, the chief priests, and the elders, to execute, was to observe his motions, and inform them when and where he might be apprehended privately without tumult, and to conduct their servants to the place. The term used was therefore pertinent, but rather soft than severe. He calls him barely *spy* or *informer*, whom he might have called traitor and perfidious.

§ 7. IT is now proper to inquire, secondly, into the use that has been made of the terms *δαιμων* and *δαιμονιον*. First, as to the word *δαιμων*, it occurs only five times in the New Testament, once in each of the three Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and twice in the Apocalypse. It is remarkable, that in the three Gospels it refers to the same possession, to wit, that of the furious man in the country of the Gadarenes, who haunted the sepulchres. There does not, however seem to be any material difference in this application from that of the diminutive

δαιμονιον, which is also used by Luke in relation to the same demoniac.

§ 8. Δαιμονιον occurs frequently in the Gospels, and always in reference to possessions, real or supposed. But the word διαβολος is never so applied. The use of the term δαιμονιον is as constantly indefinite, as the term διαβολος is definite. Not but that it is sometimes attended with the article : but, that is only when the ordinary rules of composition require that the article be used, even of a term that is strictly indefinite. Thus, when a possession is first named, it is called simply δαιμονιον, *a demon*, or πνευμα ακαθαρτον, *an unclean spirit*, never το δαιμονιον or το πνευμα ακαθαρτον. But when, in the progress of the story, mention is again made of the same demon, he is styled το δαιμονιον, *the demon*, namely, that already spoken of. And in English, as well as Greek, this is the usage with respect to all indefinites. Further, the plural δαιμονια occurs frequently, applied to the same order of beings with the singular. But what sets the difference of signification in the clearest light is that, though both words, διαβολος and δαιμονιον, occur often in the Septuagint, they are invariably used for translating different Hebrew words. Διαβολος is always in Hebrew either צר *tsar*, *enemy*, or יטש *Satan*, *adversary*, words never translated δαιμονιον. This word, on the contrary, is made to express some Hebrew term, signifying idol, pagan deity, apparition, or what some render

satyr. What the precise idea of the *demons*, to whom possessions were ascribed, then was, it would perhaps be impossible for us, with any certainty, to affirm; but as it is evident that the two words, *διαβολος* and *δαιμονιον*, are not once confounded, though the first occurs in the New Testament upwards of thirty times, and the second about sixty; they can, by no just rule of interpretation, be rendered by the same term. Possessions are never attributed to the being termed *ο διαβολος*. Nor are his authority and dominion ever ascribed to *δαιμονια*: nay, when the discriminating appellations of the devil are occasionally mentioned, *δαιμονιον* is never given as one. Thus he is called not only *ο διαβολος*, but *ο πονηρος*, *ο πειραζων*, *ο αντιδικος*, *ο σατανας*, *ο δρακων* *ο μεγας*, *ο οφεις*, *ο παλαιος*, *ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου*, *ο αρχων της εξουσιας του αερος*, and *ο θεος του αιωνος τουτου*, that is, *the devil*, *the evil one*, *the tempter*, *the adversary* (this last word answers both to *ο αντιδικος* and *ο σατανας*, which cannot be translated differently,) *the great dragon*, *the old serpent*, *the prince of this world*, *the prince of the power of the air*, and *the god of this world*. But there is no such being as *το δαιμονιον*, the appellation *δαιμονιον* being common to multitudes, whilst the other is always represented as a singular being, the only one of his kind. Not that the Jewish notion of the devil, had any resemblance to what the Persians first, and the Manicheans afterwards, called the evil principle, which they made in some sort co-ordinate with God, and the first source of all evil, as the other is of good.

For *the devil*, in the Jewish system, was a creature, as much as any other being in the universe, and as liable to be controlled by omnipotence, an attribute which they ascribed to God alone: But still the devil is spoken of as only one; and other beings, however bad, are never confounded with him.

§ 9. I KNOW but two passages of the history, that have the appearance of exceptions from this remark. One is, that wherein our Lord, when accused of casting out demons by the prince of demons, says in return, *How can Satan cast out Satan*¹⁰? there is no doubt that 'ο Σατανας and 'ο Διαβολος are the same. Here then, say the objectors, the former of these names is applied to δαιμονια, which seems to show an intercommunity of names. Yet, it must be observed, that this term *Satan*, is introduced only in the way of illustration by similitude, as the divisions in kingdoms and families also are. The utmost that can be deduced from such an example is, that they are malignant beings as well as he; engaged in the same bad cause, and perhaps of the number of those called his angels, and made to serve as his instruments. But this is no evidence that he and they are the same. The other passage is in Luke¹¹, where we have an account of the cure of a woman, who had been bowed down for eighteen years. She is said to have

¹⁰ Mark, iii. 23.

¹¹ xiii. 11.

had a spirit of infirmity ; and our Lord himself says that Satan had bound her¹². But let it be observed, first, that nothing is said that implies possession. She is not called *δαιμονιζομενη*, a *demoniac*. Our Saviour is not said to dispossess the demon, but to loose her from her infirmity : secondly, that it is a common idiom among the Jews, to put *spirit* before any quality ascribed to a person, whether it be good or bad, mental or corporeal. Thus the spirit of fear, the spirit of meekness, the spirit of slumber, the spirit of jealousy, are used to express habitual fear, &c. : thirdly, that the ascribing of her disease to Satan, does not imply possession. The former is frequent, even where there is no insinuation of the latter. All the diseased whom our Lord healed, are said to have been oppressed by the devil, *ὑπο του διαβολου*¹³. All Job's afflictions are ascribed to Satan as the cause¹⁴, yet Job is no where represented as a demoniac.

§ 10. A LATE learned and ingenious author¹⁵ has written an elaborate dissertation to evince, that there was no real possession in the demoniacs mentioned in the Gospel ; but that the style there employed was adopted, merely in conformity to popular prejudices, and used of a natural disease. His hypothesis is, by no means, necessary for supporting the distinction which I have been

¹² Mark, xiii. 16.

¹³ Acts, x. 38.

¹⁴ Job, i. and ii.

¹⁵ Dr. Farmer.

illustrating, and which is founded purely on scriptural usage. Concerning his doctrine, I shall only say, in passing, that, if there had been no more to urge from sacred writ, in favour of the common opinion, than the name *δαιμονιζομενος*, or even the phrases *δαιμονιον εχειν, εκβαλλειν*, &c. I should have thought his explanation at least not improbable. But when I find mention made of the number of demons, in particular possessions, their actions expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed, conversations held by the former, about the disposal of them, after their expulsion, and accounts given how they were actually disposed of; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct which they usually observe; it is impossible for me to deny their existence, without admitting that the sacred historians were, either deceived themselves, in regard to them, or intended to deceive their readers. Nay, if they were faithful historians, this reflection, I am afraid, will strike still deeper¹⁶. But this only by the

¹⁶ The following observation from the judicious Mr. Jortin's excellent remarks on ecclesiastical history, appears to me a strong confirmation of the judgment I have given^a. "In the New Testament, where any circumstances are added concerning the demoniacs, they are generally such as shew that there was something preternatural in the distemper; for these disordered persons agreed in one story, and paid homage to Christ and to his Apostles, which is not to be expected from madmen, of whom some would have worshipped, and others

^a 2d Edit. Vol. I. p. 10.

way. To enter farther into the question here, would be foreign to my purpose. The reader of Dr. Farmer's performance, which is written very plausibly, will judge for himself.

§ 11. I OBSERVE further that, though we cannot discover, with certainty, from all that is said in the Gospel concerning possession, whether the demons were conceived to be the ghosts of wicked men deceased, or lapsed angels, or (as was the opinion of some early Christian writers¹⁷) the mongrel breed of certain angels (whom they understood by *the sons of God* mentioned in Genesis¹⁸), and of *the daughters of men*: it is plain they were conceived to be malignant spirits. They are exhibited as the causes of the most direful calamities to the unhappy persons whom they possess, dumbness, deafness, madness, palsy, epilepsy, and the like. The descriptive titles given them, always denote some ill quality or other. Most frequently they are called *πνευματα ακαθαρτα*, *unclean spirits*, sometimes *πνευματα πονηρα*, *malign spirits*. They are represented as conscious that they are doomed to misery and torments, though their punishment be for a while suspended. Art thou come hither, *βασανισαι ημας*, *to torment us before the time*¹⁹?

“ would have reviled Christ, according to the various humour
“ and behaviour observable in such persons.”

¹⁷ Just. M. Apol. i.

¹⁸ vi. 2.

¹⁹ Matth. viii. 29.

§ 12. BUT, though this is the character of those demons who were dislodged by our Lord, out of the bodies of men and women possessed by them; it does not follow, that the word *demon* always conveys this bad sense, even in the New Testament. This having been a word much in use among the heathen, from whom the Hellenist Jews first borrowed it, it is reasonable to expect, that, when it is used in speaking of pagans, their customs, worship and opinions; more especially when pagans are represented as employing the term, the sense should be that which is conformable, or nearly so, to classical use. Now, in classical use, the word signified a divine being, though not in the highest order of their divinities, and therefore supposed not equivalent to *Θεος*, but superior to human, and consequently, by the maxims of their theology, a proper object of adoration. "All demons," says Plato, "are an intermediate order between God and mortals²⁰." But though they commonly used the term in a good sense, they did not so always. They had evil demons as well as good. *Juxta usurpatam*, says Calcidius, *penes Græcos loquendi consuetudinem, tam sancti sunt dæmones quam profesti et infidi*. But when no bad quality is ascribed to the demon or demons spoken of, and nothing affirmed that implies it, the acceptation of the term, in pagan writers, is generally favourable. Who has not heard of the demon of Socrates?

²⁰ Παν το δαιμονιον μεταξυ εστι θεου τε και θνητου. Sympos.

§ 13. IN this way, the word is to be understood, in the only passage of the Acts where it occurs²¹: *Οι δε, Ξενων δαιμονιων δοκει καταγγελευς ειναι. Others said, he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods.* So our translators render it. The reason of this verdict is added, *because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection, τον Ιησουν και την Αναστασιν.* They supposed the former to be a male, and the latter a female divinity; for it was customary with them to deify abstract qualities, making them either gods or goddesses, as suited the gender of the name. This, if I remember right, is the only passage in the New Testament, in which *δαιμονια* is not rendered devils, but *gods*. If our translators had adhered to their method of rendering this word in every other instance, and said, *He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange devils*, they would have grossly perverted the sense of the passage. Now, this may suggest a suspicion of the impropriety of this version of the word any where, but especially where it relates to the objects of worship among the pagans, with whom the term, when unaccompanied with a bad epithet, or any thing in the context that fixes the application to evil spirits, was always employed in a good sense.

§ 14. THERE is a famous passage to this purpose in the writings of the Apostle Paul²², on which I shall lay before the reader a few observations.

²¹ Acts, xvii. 18.

²² 1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

Ἄ θυει τα εθνη, δαιμονιοις θυει, και ου Θεω· ου θελω δε υμας κοινωνους των δαιμονιων γινεσθαι. Ου δυνασθε ποτηριον Κυριου πινειν και ποτηριον δαιμονιων· ου δυνασθε τραπεζης Κυδιου μετεχειν, και τραπεζης δαιμονιων. In the English Bible thus rendered, *The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of devils.* Passing the impropriety, so often observed above, of representing a name as common to many, which Scripture has invariably appropriated to one; the sentiment itself expressed by our translators, that the Gentiles sacrifice to devils, is not just, whether we consider the thing abstractly, or in relation to the intention of the worshippers.

Considered abstractly, the pagan worship and sacrifices were not offered to God, whom they knew not, and to whose character and attributes there was nothing in the popular creed (I speak not of philosophers) that bore the least affinity. But, as little were they offered to that being, whom Christians and Jews call the devil or Satan, with whose character or history they were equally unacquainted. Nor is it enough to say, that the characters of their deities were so bad, that they partook more of the diabolical nature than of the divine. For this does not hold universally. Pagan nations sometimes deified men who had been their benefactors. Osiris is said to have invented the plough, and to have been the first who taught

the Egyptians husbandry. Though not, on that account, entitled to adoration, yet surely not deserving to be looked on as the devil or enemy of mankind. But admitting it to be true, as it doubtless is, that the characters of their gods were often such as to resemble the devilish nature more than the divine; evil spirits are not understood as excluded from the import of the term *δαιμονια*. As little, on the other hand, ought that term to be confined to such. The proper notion is, beings, in respect of power, (whatever be their other qualities) superior to human, but inferior to that which we Christians comprehend under the term *divine*. For this reason, even the higher orders of the heathen divinities, those whom they styled *Dii majorum gentium*, are included in the Apostle's declaration. For, though they, more rarely, applied to such the terms *δαιμων* and *διαμονιον*, the power ascribed to them, by their votaries, was infinitely short of omnipotence, as indeed all their other attributes were short of the divine perfections. Paul acknowledged no God but one, of whom the Gentiles were ignorant, and to whom, therefore, they could not offer sacrifice. All beings of a subordinate nature, however much they might be accounted superior to us, he classes under the same general name. 'But can Jupiter himself be included in this description, Jupiter to whom almighty power and supreme dominion are attributed, and who is styled by the poets, *The father of gods and men, the greatest and best of beings?*' The attributes sometimes given to Jupiter, must be considered as words

merely complimentary and adulatory; they being utterly inconsistent with the accounts which the same persons give of his origin and history. They are like the titles with which earthly potentates are saluted by their flatterers, when styled fathers of their country, absolute lords of earth and ocean. De la Motte's reply to Madam Dacier²³, is here very apposite: "What! Could Homer seriously believe Jupiter to be the creator of gods and men? Could he think him the father of his own father Saturn, whom he drove out of heaven, or of Juno his sister, and his wife; of Neptune and Pluto his brothers, or of the nymphs, who had the charge of him in his childhood; or of the giants who made war upon him, and would have dethroned him if they had been then arrived at the age of manhood? How well his actions justify the Latin epithets, *optimus, maximus*, so often given him, all the world knows." Jupiter has, therefore, no right to be held an exception, but is, with strict propriety, comprehended in the name *δαιμονια* attributed, by the Apostle, to all the heathen gods. But *δαιμονιον*, as we have seen, is one thing, and *ὁ διαβολος* is another. Now, if a supposed resemblance, in disposition, between the heathen gods and the devil, were a sufficient foundation for what is affirmed in the common version; any vicious person of whom mention is made in history, such as Cain, Ham, Jezebel, in whom one

²³ De la Critique; seconde partie. Des Dieux.

might fancy a likeness in character or actions to some divinities of the heathen, might, with equal propriety as the devil, be called the objects of their adoration.

§ 15. THERE are two passages in the Old Testament, one in the Pentateuch²⁴, the other in the Psalms²⁵ to which, particularly the first, the Apostle had doubtless an allusion. In both, the term used by the Septuagint is *δαιμονια*: the Hebrew term is not the same in both places, but in neither is it a word which is ever translated *διαβοχος*, by the Seventy. In the Psalm referred to, the term in the original, is that which is commonly rendered *idols*. Now, in regard to idols, the Apostle had said in the same Epistle²⁶, that *an idol is nothing in the world*; in other words, is the representation of no real existence in the universe, though it may be the representation of an imaginary being. It is as much as to say, Jupiter, and Juno, and Saturn, and all the rest of the heathen gods, as delineated by the poets and mythologists, are nonentities, the mere creatures of imagination. Now, if an idol represent no real being, it does not represent the devil, whose existence is, on the Christian hypothesis, beyond a question. But, I am aware of the objection that, if idols represent no real beings, they either do not represent demons, or demons are not real beings. I answer, it is true, that no individual demons, actually existing, are

²⁴ Deut. xxxii. 17.

²⁵ Psal. xcvi. 5.

²⁶ 1 Cor. viii. 4.

properly represented by their idols; nevertheless, these may, with strict justice, be said to represent the genus or kind, that is, beings intermediate between God and man, less than the former, greater than the latter. For to all who come under this description, real or imaginary, good or bad, the name *demons* is promiscuously given. The reality of such intermediate orders of beings, revelation every where supposes, and rational theism does not contradict. Now, it is to *the kind* expressed in the definition now given, that the pagan deities are represented as corresponding, and not individually, to *particular demons* actually existing. To say, therefore, that the Gentiles sacrifice to *demons*, is no more than to say, that they sacrifice to beings which, whether real or imaginary, we perceive, from their own accounts of them, to be below the supreme. "What are men?" says a dialogist in Lucian²⁷. The answer is, "Mortal gods. What are gods? Immortal men." In fact, immortality was almost the only distinction between them.

§ 16. THIS leads directly to the examination of the justness of the sentiment, that *the Gentiles sacrifice to devils*, in the second view of it that was suggested, or considered in relation to the ideas and intentions of the worshippers themselves, to which alone, in my apprehension, the Apostle here alludes. First then, we may justly say, that

²⁷ Vitarum auctio. Τι δαι' οι ανθρωποι; θεοι θνητοι τι δαι δι θεοι; ανθρωποι αθανατοι.

their sacrifices were not offered to God; for, however much they might use the name of God, the intention is to be judged, not by the name, but by the meaning affixed to it. Now, such a being as the eternal, unoriginated, immutable, Creator and Ruler of the world, they had not in all their system, and therefore did not adore. For this reason, they are not unjustly termed, by the same Apostle, *αθεοι*, *atheists*²⁸, without God, that is, without the knowledge, and, consequently, the belief and worship, of him who alone is God. But their sacrifices and devotions were presented to beings, to whom they themselves ascribed a character infinitely inferior to what we know to belong to the true God, of whom they were ignorant.

A late philosopher, who will not be suspected of partiality to the sentiments of an Apostle, or of the weakness of a bias in favour of Christianity, has, nevertheless, in this instance, adopted the ideas of the sacred author, and has not hesitated to pronounce the pagans²⁹ *a kind of superstitious atheists, who acknowledged no being that corresponds to our idea of a deity*. Besides, a great part of the heathen worship was confessedly paid to the ghosts of departed heroes, of conquerors, and potentates, and of the inventors of arts, whom popular superstition, after disguising their history with fables and absurdities, had blindly deified. Now, to all such beings, they themselves, as well as the Jews, assigned the name *δαιμονια*. Fur-

²⁸ Eph. ii. 12.²⁹ Natural History of Religion, Sect. IV.

ther, it deserves our notice, that the Apostle is not writing here to Hebrews, but to Greeks; and that he himself, being a native of a Grecian city, knew perfectly the sense that was affixed by them to the word *δαιμονια*. If, therefore, he had intended to suggest, that they were all malignant beings to whom their devotions were addressed, he would never have used the general term, which he knew they commonly understood in a more favourable sense. In that case, he would have said *κακοδαιμοσι θυει*, or something equivalent.

§ 17. HOWEVER much, therefore, the gentiles might have disputed the truth of the first part of the Apostle's assertion, that they did not offer sacrifice to God, because they were not sensible of their own ignorance, on this article; the latter part of the assertion they would have readily admitted, that they sacrificed to demons, such as the spirits of heroes and heroines deceased, and other beings conceived superior to mere mortals. This charge they themselves would not have pretended to be either injurious or untrue. The very passage formerly quoted from the Acts, where they call Jesus and the resurrection *strange demons*, *ξενα δαιμονια*, shews, that there were *known demons*, *γνωριμα δαιμονια*, to whose service they were accustomed. We cannot worship whom we do not mean to worship. There is an inconsistency in the ideas. They could, therefore, no more be said to have worshipped the devil, as we Christians understand the

term, than they could be said to have worshipped the cannibals of New Zealand, because they had no more conception of the one than of the other. However much it may be in the spirit of theological controvertists, to use amplifications irreconcilable with truth and justice, in order to render an adversary odious; this manner is not in the spirit of the sacred penmen. Some appearances of the polemic temper there are in most versions of the New Testament, which will be found to spring entirely from translators. The popular doctrine has indeed been adopted by Milton, and greatly embellished in his incomparable poem. But it is not from the fictions of poets that we must draw the principles of religion.

§ 18. I MUST likewise own that, when, in the passage to the Corinthians under examination, we render *δαιμονια* *demons*, we still express the sentiment more harshly than it is in the original, because the word was commonly then used in a good sense, not, as we Christians use it at present, invariably in a bad sense. One way, however, of restoring it to its proper import, is to preserve sacredly the distinction, which holy writ so plainly authorizes, and never to confound terms as synonymous, which are there never confounded.

§ 19. THE above observations may serve also to illustrate a noted passage in the Apocalypse³⁰:

³⁰ Rev. ix. 20.

The rest of the men which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, δαιμόνια, and idols of gold and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk. It is equally manifest here, as in the former example, that the word rendered *devils*, ought to have been *demons*; nor is it less manifest, that every being who is not the one true God, however much conceived to be superior to us, whether good or bad, hero or heroine, demigod or demigoddess, angel or departed spirit, saint or sinner, real or imaginary, is in the class comprized under the name *demons*. And the worship of them is as much *demonolatry* (if you will admit the word) as the worship of Jupiter, Mars, and Minerva. This may serve to show, of how much consequence it is to attend, with accuracy, to the differences to be found in the application of words. It is only thereby that we can learn their exact import, and be qualified to judge, both of the subject, and of the completion, of scriptural prophecies. As to the worship of *the devil του διαβολου*, nothing can be clearer than that, in Scripture, no pagans are charged with it; and as to the worship των δαιμονιων, beings subordinate to the supreme, it may be considered how far we can, with justice, say that the pagans are peculiarly chargeable. It will deserve to be remarked, by the way, that the only difference between *demonolatry* and *idolatry* appears to be, that the first regards the object of worship, the second the mode. The

former is a violation of the first commandment, the latter of the second. The connection, however, is so intimate between them, that they have rarely, if ever, been found separate.

§ 20. THERE are only two other passages wherein the word *δαιμονια* occurs in the New Testament, in both which there is some difficulty. One is, where Paul warns Timothy³¹ of those who would make a defection from the faith, *giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils, διδασκαλιας δαιμονιων*, doctrines of demons. It is hard to say, whether, by this phrase, we are to understand doctrines suggested by demons, or doctrines concerning demons. The form of expression will support either meaning. If the first, the word *demons* is taken in a bad sense, for ghosts, or other spirits of a malignant character, the common acceptance of the word in the Gospels, where an agency on human beings is ascribed to them. The connection of the words, *doctrines of demons*, with *seducing spirits*, immediately preceding, gives some plausibility to this interpretation. If the second, there is reason to think, that it is used more extensively, for all those beings, inferior to God, who are made objects of adoration. In this case, the words foretel either a total apostacy from the faith of the Gospel, to heathen demonology, commonly called mythology, or a defection from the purity of its doctrine, by admitting an unnatural mix-

³¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1.

ture of heathenish absurdities. That this is his meaning, is rendered not improbable, by its being connected with other corruptions of the Christian doctrine, also introduced some ages after the times of the Apostles, and implied in the words, *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, &c.* But with respect to this question, I do not pretend to decide.

§ 21. THE other passage is in the Epistle of James³². The whole verse in the common version runs thus: *Thou believest that there is one God; thou dost well: the devils also believe and tremble: τα δαιμονια*, the demons. That the Apostle here means the spirits of wicked men deceased, which (in Jewish use, as we learn from Josephus) were commonly styled demons, there is no reason to question. The only points of which their belief is asserted, are the being and the unity of the Godhead. The epithet *δαιμονιωδης* is accordingly used in a bad sense in this Epistle³³, where that wisdom which produceth envy and contention, is styled earthly, sensual, *devilish*, *δαιμονιωδης*, demonian.

§ 22. THE only other words in the New Testament, connected with *δαιμων*, are *δαισιδαιμων* and *δαισιδαιμονια*. Each occurs only once. The former is rendered, by our translators, *superstitious*, the latter *superstition*. Neither of them is found

³² James, ii. 19.

³³ iii. 15.

in the Septuagint, or the Apocrypha, or in any part of the New Testament, except the Acts of the Apostles. We may readily believe, that the Jews, in speaking of their own religion, would avoid the use of terms bearing so manifest an allusion to a species of worship which it condemns. The only place where the term *δεισιδαιμων* occurs, is Paul's speech in the Areopagus at Athens. It is applied by him to the Athenians, who were pagans. *Ανδρες Αθηναιοι*, says he, *κατα παντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστερους ὑμας θεωρω*³⁴; in the common version, *Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.* The English expression is, in my opinion, much harsher than the Greek. As the word nowhere else occurs in the sacred writings, our only rule for ascertaining its import is the classical application. Besides, the Apostle, being a native of a Grecian city, well knew in what sense his hearers would understand the term. If, then, he spoke to be understood, we must suppose that he employed his words according to their current value in the place. Now, it is plain that, in the classical use, *δεισιδαιμων* has not a bad meaning, unless there be something in the context that leads us to an unfavourable interpretation. *Αιει δε δεισιδαιμων ην*; *He was always a religious man*, says Xenophon of Agesilaus, when he is plainly commending him. Favorinus explains the word by *ο ευσεβης*, *pious*; and gives *ευλαβεια* as the com-

³⁴ Acts, xvii. 22.

mon import of *δεισιδαιμονια*, which he resolves into *φοβος Θεου η δαιμονων*, *the fear of God, or of demons*.

Now, it has been shewn that, among pagans, in the common acceptation of *δαιμων*, the meaning was favourable. It is acknowledged that *δεισιδαιμων* was also susceptible of a bad meaning, answering to our word *superstitious*. Further, I readily admit that the Apostle would not probably have used that term in speaking of either Jews or Christians, because he did not consider the *δαιμονες* as objects of their veneration. At the same time, he knew that, in addressing the Athenians, he employed a term which could not be offensive to them. Indeed, his manner of introducing his subject, shews a desire of softening the disapprobation which his words imply, and from which he took occasion to expound the principles of a more sublime theology. The Athenians gloried in the character of being more religious, *δεισιδαιμονεστεροι*, than any other Grecian state. Paul's concession of this point in their favour, would rather gratify than offend them, and would serve to alleviate the censure of carrying their religion to excess. Every thing, in the turn of his expression, shews that it was his intention to tell them, in the mildest terms, what he found censurable in their devotion, and thence to take occasion of preaching to them the only true God. Accordingly, he employed a word, which he knew no pagan could take amiss; and to denote the excess with which he thought them chargeable, he chose

to use the comparative degree, which was the gentlest manner of doing it. Nay, he even abates the import of the comparative, by the particle *ὡς*. Beza has properly rendered the expression, *quasi religiosiores*. The version, *too superstitious*, not only deviates from the intention of the speaker, but includes a gross impropriety, as it implies that it is right to be superstitious to a certain degree, and that the error lies in exceeding that degree : whereas, in the universal acceptance of the English term, all superstition is excess, and therefore faulty.

As to the noun *δουσιδαιμονια*, in the only place of Scripture where it occurs, it is mentioned as used by a heathen, in relation to the Jewish religion. Festus, the president, when he acquainted king Agrippa concerning Paul, at that time his prisoner, says that he found the accusation brought against him, by his countrymen, not to be such as he had expected, but to consist in *ζητηματα τινα περι της ιδιας δεισιδαιμονιας*, in the English translation, *certain questions of their own superstition*³⁵. It was not unlike a Roman magistrate to call the Jewish religion *superstition*. That the Gentiles were accustomed to speak of it contemptuously, is notorious. But it should be considered, that Festus was then addressing his discourse to king Agrippa, who had come to Caesarea to congratulate him, whom he knew to be a Jew, and to whom it appears, from the whole of the story, that Festus meant to show the utmost

³⁵ Acts, xxv. 19.

civility. It cannot then be imagined, that he would intentionally affront a visitant of his rank, the very purpose of whose visit had been to do him honour on his promotion. That the ordinary import of the term was favourable, cannot be questioned. Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the religious service performed by the high-priest, at which the kings of Egypt were obliged to be present, adds, *Ταυτα δ'επραττεν, ἅμα μὲν εἰς δεισιδαιμονίαν καὶ θεοφιλή βίον τὸν βασιλεῖα προτρέπομενος*³⁶. "These things he did to excite the king to a devout and pious life." The word, therefore, ought to have been rendered *religion*, according to its primitive and most usual acceptance among the Greeks.

Bishop Pearce is, for aught I know, singular in thinking that *της ιδίας δεισιδαιμονίας* ought to be translated *of a private superstition*, meaning the Christian doctrine taught by Paul. But of this version the words are evidently not susceptible; the only authority alleged is Peter, who says³⁷, *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ιδίας ἐπιλυσῆως οὐ γινεται*, in the common translation, *No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation*. Admitting that this is a just expression of the sense of that passage, the cases are not parallel. *Ἰδιος* has there no article. If the import of *ιδίος* in the other place were *private*, the meaning of the phrase must not be *a* but *the* private superstition, or the private religion. Had we any evidence that this designation had been given to

³⁶ Lib. i.³⁷ 2 Peter, i. 20.

Christianity in the times of the Apostles, there might be some plausibility in the conjecture. But there is no trace of such a designation; and indeed it would have been exceedingly improper as applied to a doctrine, which was preached publicly every where, and of whose ministers, both Jews and Pagans complained that they turned the world upside down. There are few words in the New Testament more common than *ιδιος*, but there is not a single instance wherein it is accompanied with the article, that can be rendered otherwise than *his own*, *her own*, or *their own*.

§ 23. So much for the distinction uniformly observed in Scripture between the words *διαβολος* and *δαιμονιον*; to which I shall only add, that in the ancient Syriac version, these names are always duly distinguished. The words employed in translating one of them are never used in rendering the other; and in all the Latin translations I have seen, ancient and modern, Popish and Protestant, this distinction is carefully observed. It is observed also in Diodati's Italian version, and most of the late French versions. But in Luther's German translation, the Geneva French, and the common English, the words are confounded in the manner above observed. Some of the later English translations have corrected this error, and some have implicitly followed the common version.

PART II.

Ἅδης AND Γεεννα.

THE next example I shall produce of words in which, though commonly translated by the same English term, there is a real difference of signification, shall be *Ἅδης* and *γεεννα*, in the common version rendered *hell*. That *γεεννα* is employed in the New Testament to denote the place of future punishment prepared for the devil and his angels, is indisputable. In the Old Testament we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned. Accordingly the word *γεεννα* does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and consequently not to be found in the Grecian classics. It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words *גֵּי הִנּוֹם* *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the Book of Joshua³⁸. It was there that the cruel sacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitish idol³⁹. The place was also called *Tophet*⁴⁰, and that, as is supposed, from the noise of drums, (Toph signifying a drum,) a noise raised on purpose to drown the cries of the helpless infants. As this place was, in process of time, considered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the

³⁸ Jos. xv. 8. It is rendered by the 70 Jos. xviii. 16. *Γαι-Εννομ*, and in some editions, *Γαιεννα*, hence the name in the N. T.

³⁹ 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6.

⁴⁰ 2 Kings, xxiii. 10.

punishment of the wicked in a future state, the name *Tophet* came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it. This is the sense, if I mistake not, in which *gehenna*, a synonymous term, is always to be understood in the New Testament, where it occurs just twelve times. In ten of these there can be no doubt: in the other two the expression is figurative; but it scarcely will admit a question, that the figure is taken from that state of misery which awaits the impenitent. Thus the Pharisees are said to make the proselyte, whom they compass sea and land to gain, twofold more a child of hell, *υιος γεεννης*, than themselves⁴¹; an expression both similar in form, and equivalent in signification, to *υιος διαβολου*, *son of the devil*, and *υιος της απωλειας*, *son of perdition*. In the other passage an unruly tongue is said to be *set on fire of hell*⁴², *φλογιζομενη υπο της γεεννης*. These two cannot be considered as exceptions, it being the manifest intention of the writers in both to draw an illustration of the subject from that state of perfect wretchedness.

§ 2. As to the word *αδης*, which occurs in eleven places of the New Testament, and is rendered *hell* in all, except one, where it is translated *grave*, it is quite common in classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament. In my judgment, it ought

⁴¹ Matt. xxiii. 15.

⁴² James, iii. 6.

never in Scripture to be rendered *hell*, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians. In the Old Testament the corresponding word is שְׁאוֹל *sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used Ἅδης. This word is also used sometimes in rendering the nearly synonymous words or phrases בּוֹר *bor*, and אֲבְנֵי בּוֹר *abne bor*, *the pit*, and *stones of the pit*, צֶל מוֹת *tsal moth*, *the shades of death*, דּוּמָה *dumeh*, *silence*. The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark, and silent, about which the most prying eye, and listening ear, can acquire no information. The term Ἅδης, *hades*, is well adapted to express this idea. It was written anciently, as we learn from the poets (for what is called the poetic, is nothing but the ancient dialect,) ἄδης, *ab a privativa et εἰδω video*, and signifies obscure, hidden, invisible. To this the word *hell* in its primitive signification perfectly corresponded. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects⁴³.

But though our word *hell*, in its original signification, was more adapted to express the sense of

⁴³ See Junius' Gothic Glossary, subjoined to the Codex Argenteus, on the word *hulyan*.

ἄδης than of γέεννα, it is not so now. When we speak as Christians, we always express by it, the place of the punishment of the wicked after the general judgment, as opposed to *heaven*, the place of the reward of the righteous. It is true that, in translating heathen poets, we retain the old sense of the word *hell*, which answers to the Latin *orcus*, or rather *infernus*, as when we speak of the descent of Æneas, or of Orpheus, into *hell*. Now the word *infernus*, in Latin, comprehends the receptacle of all the dead, and contains both *elysium* the place of the blessed, and *tartarus* the abode of the miserable. The term *inferi*, comprehends all the inhabitants good and bad, happy and wretched. The Latin words *infernus* and *inferi* bear evident traces of the notion that the repository of the souls of the departed is under ground. This appears also to have been the opinion of both Greeks and Hebrews, and indeed of all antiquity. How far the ancient practice of burying the body may have contributed to produce this idea concerning the mansion of the ghosts of the deceased, I shall not take it upon me to say ; but it is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, nor in the New, does the word ἄδης convey the meaning which the present English word *hell*, in the Christian usage, always conveys to our minds.

§ 3. IT were endless to illustrate this remark by an enumeration and examination of all the passages in both Testaments wherein the word is

found. The attempt would be unnecessary, as it is hardly now pretended by any critic, that this is the acceptation of the term in the Old Testament. Who, for example, would render the words of the venerable patriarch Jacob⁴⁴, when he was deceived by his sons into the opinion that his favourite child Joseph had been devoured by a wild beast, *I will go down to hell to my son mourning ?* or the words which he used⁴⁵, when they expostulated with him, about sending his youngest son Benjamin into Egypt along with them ; *Ye will bring down my grey heirs with sorrow to hell ?* Yet in both places the word, in the original, is *sheol*, and in the version of the Seventy, *hades*. I shall only add, that in the famous passage from the Psalms⁴⁶, quoted in the Acts of the Apostles⁴⁷, of which I shall have occasion to take notice afterwards ; though the word is the same both in Hebrew and in Greek, as in the two former quotations, and though it is, in both places, rendered *hell* in the common version, it would be absurd to understand it as denoting the place of the damned, whether the expression be interpreted literally of David the type, or of Jesus Christ the antitype, agreeably to its principal and ultimate object.

§ 4. BUT it appears at present to be the prevailing opinion among critics, that the term, at least in the Old Testament, means no more than קבר

⁴⁴ Gen. xxxvii. 35. ⁴⁵ xlii. 38. ⁴⁶ Psal. xvi. 10.

⁴⁷ Acts, ii. 27.

keber, *grave* or *sepulchre*. Of the truth of this opinion, after the most attentive, and I think impartial, examination, I am far from being convinced. At the same time I am not insensible of the weight which is given to that interpretation, by some great names in the learned world, particularly that of Father Simon, a man deeply versed in Oriental literature, who has expressly said⁴⁸, that *sheol* signifies in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, *sepulchre*, and who has strenuously and repeatedly defended this sentiment, against Le Clerc and others who had attacked it⁴⁹. And since he seems even to challenge his opponents to produce examples, from the Old Testament, wherein the word *sheol* has the signification which they ascribe to it; I shall here briefly, with all the deference due to names so respectable as those which appear on the opposite side, lay before the reader the result of my inquiries upon the question.

§ 5. I FREELY acknowledge that, by translating *sheol the grave*, the purport of the sentence is often expressed with sufficient clearness.' The example last quoted from Genesis is an evidence. *Ye will bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave*, undoubtedly gives the meaning of the sentence in the original, notwithstanding that the

⁴⁸ Hist. Crit. du N. T. ch. 12.

⁴⁹ Reponse a la Defense des Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, ch. xvi.

English word *grave* does not give the meaning of the Hebrew word *sheol*. This may, at first, appear a paradox, but will not be found so, when examined. Suppose one, in relating the circumstances of a friend's death, should say, "This unlucky accident brought him to his shroud," another should say, "It brought him to his coffin," a third, "It brought him to his grave." The same sentiment is expressed by them all, and these plain words, "This accident proved the cause of his death," are equivalent to what was said by every one of them. But, can we justly infer thence, that the English words *shroud*, *coffin*, *grave*, and *death*, are synonymous terms? It will not be pretended by those who know English. Yet I have not heard any argument stronger than this, for accounting the Hebrew words *sheol* and *keber* synonymous. The cases are entirely parallel. Used as tropes they often are so. Who can question that, when there is any thing figurative in the expression, the sense may be conveyed without the figure, or by another figure? And if so, the figures or tropes, however different, may doubtless, in such application, be called synonymous to one another, and to the proper term⁵⁰.

⁵⁰ This is precisely the idea which Cappellus (to whom Hebrew criticism owes more perhaps than to any other individual) had of the relation between the words *sheol* and *keber*. In answer to Villalpandus, who, in explaining a Hebrew inscription, supposes *sh* the letter *schin*, to stand for *sheol* and mean *sepulchre*, he expresses himself, thus, "Quis non videt, quam

Now, if this holds of the tropes of the same language, it holds also of those of different languages. You may adopt a trope in translating, which does not literally answer to that of the original, and which, nevertheless, conveys the sense of the original, more justly than the literal version would have done. But in this case, though the whole sentence, in the version, corresponds to the whole sentence, in the original, there is not the like correspondence in the words taken severally. Sometimes the reverse happens, to wit, that every word of a sentence, in the original, has a word exactly corresponding, in the version; and yet the whole sentence, in the one, does not correspond to the whole sentence, in the other. The different geniuses of different languages, render it impossible to obtain, always, a correspondence, in both respects. When it can be had only in one, the sentiment is always to be preferred to the words. For this reason I do not know how our translators could have rendered *sheol* in that passage better than they have done. Taken by itself, we have no word in our language that answers to it. The Latin is, in this instance, luckier; as it supplies a word perfectly equivalent to that of the sacred penman, at the same time that it justly expresses the sense of the

“coacta sit ejusmodi interpretatio, quamque aliena a more,
 “ingenio, et phrasi verè ebraicâ. Nam ut שׁ significet שׁאול
 “quis Ebraismi peritus dixerit, cum שׁאול *sepulcrum* non signi-
 “ficet, nisi figuratâ locutione apud prophetas, qui tropicè lo-
 “quantur.” Diatriba de literis Ebr.

whole. Such is the translation of the verse in the Vulgate, *Deducetis canos meos cum dolore ad inferos*. Now, though our word *the grave*, may answer sufficiently in some cases, for expressing, not the import of the Hebrew word *sheol*, but the purport of the sentence, it gives, in other cases, but a feeble, and sometimes an improper, version of the original. But this will be more evident afterwards.

§ 6. FIRST, in regard to the situation of *hades*, it seems always to have been conceived by both Jews and pagans, as in the lower parts of the earth, near its centre, as we should term it, or its foundation (according to the notions of the Hebrews, who knew nothing of its spherical figure,) and answering in depth to the visible heavens in height; both which are, on this account, oftener than once, contrasted in sacred writ. In general, to express any thing inconceivably deep, this word is adopted, which shows sufficiently that unfathomable depth was always a concomitant of the idea conveyed by *sheol*. Thus God is represented by Moses as saying⁵¹, *A fire is kindled in mine anger, which shall burn to the lowest hell*, as it is rendered in the common version. The word is *sheol* or *hades*; and Simon himself admits⁵², that it is here an hyperbole, which signifies that the fire should reach the bottom of the earth, and consume the whole earth. I acknowledge that it is, in this passage, used hyperbolically.

⁵¹ Deut. xxxii. 22.

⁵² Reponse a la Defense, &c. ch. xvi.

But will any person pretend that it could have answered the purpose of giving the most terrible view of divine judgments, if the literal meaning of the word had implied no more than a grave? This concession of Simon's is, in effect giving up the cause. According to the explanation I have given of the proper sense of the word, it was perfectly adapted to such an use, and made a very striking hyperbole; but if his account of the literal and ordinary import of the term be just; the expression, so far from being hyperbolical, would have been the reverse.

In further evidence of this doctrine, the inhabitants of *ἀδης* are, from their subterranean abode, denominated by the Apostle Paul⁵³, *καταχθονιοι*, a word of the same import with the phrase *ὑποκατω της γης*, *under the earth*, in the Apocalypse⁵⁴, and which, with the *επουραριοι* and *επιγειοι* *celestial* beings, and *terrestrial*, include the whole rational creation. That they are expressly enumerated as including the whole, will be manifest to every one who attentively peruses the two passages referred to. Of the coincidence of the Hebrew notions, and the pagan, in regard to the situation of the place of departed spirits, if it were necessary to add any thing to what has been observed above, from the import of the names *infernus* and *inferi*, those beautiful lines of Virgil might suffice :

⁵³ Phil. ii. 10.

⁵⁴ v. 3.

Non secus, ac si quâ penitus vi terra dehiscens
 Infernas reseret sedes, et regna recludat
 Pallida, diis invisâ, superque immane barathrum
 Cernatur, trepidentque immisso lumine manes ⁵⁵.

§ 7. SEVERAL proofs might be brought from the Prophets, and even from the Gospels, of the opposition in which heaven for height, and hades for depth, were conceived to stand to each other. I shall produce but a few from the Old Testament, which convey the most precise notion of their sentiments on this subject. The first is from the Book of Job ⁵⁶, where we have an illustration of the unsearchableness of the divine perfections in these memorable words, as found in the common version, *Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? Deeper than hell, βαθυτερα δε των εν αδου, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea.* Now, of the opinion that the word in the Old Testament always denotes *grave* or *sepulchre*, nothing can be a fuller confutation than this passage. Among such immense distances as the height of heaven, the extent of the earth, and the ocean, which were not only in those days unknown to men, but conceived to be unknowable; to introduce as one of the unmeasurables, a sepulchre whose depth could scarcely exceed ten or twelve cubits, and which, being the work of men,

⁵⁵ Æn. viii.

⁵⁶ Job, xi. 7, 8, 9.

was perfectly known, would have been absurd indeed, not to say ridiculous. What man in his senses could have said, ‘Ye can no more comprehend the Deity, than ye can discover the height of the firmament, or measure the depth of a grave.’

A passage very similar we have in the Psalms⁵⁷, where heaven and *ἀδης* are in the same way contrasted. *If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there : if I make my bed in hell, εαν καταβω εις τον ἀδην, behold thou art there.* The only other place I shall mention is in the Prophet Amos⁵⁸, where God is represented as saying, *Though they dig into hell, εις ἀδον, thence shall my hand take them ; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down ; and though they hide themselves on the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence ; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command a serpent, and he shall bite them.* Here for illustration we have a double contrast. To the top of Carmel, a very high mountain, the bottom of the sea is very properly contrasted ; but to heaven, which is incomparably higher than the highest mountain, no suitable contrast is found, except *sheol* or *hades*, which was evidently conceived to be the lowest thing in the world. The *επιγειοι* were supposed to possess the middle parts, the *επουρανιοι* and *καταχθονιοι* occupied the extremes, the former in height, the latter in depth. A late writer, of profound erudition, of whose sentiments, on this subject, I shall have occasion

⁵⁷ Psal. cxxxix. 8.

⁵⁸ Amos, ix. 2, 3.

soon to take notice, has quoted the above passage of Amos, to prove that *into sheol men penetrate by digging* : he might, with equal reason, have quoted it to prove that *into heaven men penetrate by climbing*, or that men, in order to hide themselves, have recourse to the bottom of the sea.

§ 8. AGAIN, let it be observed, that *keber*, the Hebrew word for *grave* or *sepulchre*, is never rendered in the ancient translation *ἀδης*, but *ταφος*, *μνημα*, or some equivalent term. *Sheol*, on the contrary, is never rendered *ταφος* or *μνημα*, but always *ἀδης* ; nor is it ever construed with *θαπτω*, or any verb which signifies to bury, a thing almost inevitable, in words so frequently occurring, if it had ever properly signified a grave. This itself might suffice to show that the ideas which the Jews had of these were never confounded. I observe further, that *ἀδης* as well as the corresponding Hebrew word, is always singular in meaning, as well as in form. The word for *grave* is often plural. The former never admits the possessive pronouns, being the receptacle of all the dead, and therefore incapable of an appropriation to individuals, the latter often. Where the disposal of the body or corpse is spoken of, *ταφος*, or some equivalent term, is the name of its repository. When mention is made of the spirit after death, its abode is *ἀδης*. When notice is taken of one's making or visiting the grave of any person, touching it, mourning at it, or erecting a

pillar or monument upon it, and the like, it is always *keber* that is employed. Add to all this that, in *hades*, all the dead are represented as present, without exception. The case is quite different with the graves or sepulchres. Thus, Isaiah represents, very beautifully and poetically, a great and sudden desolation that would be brought upon the earth, saying⁵⁹, *Hades*, which is in the common version *Hell*, *hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure. Hades* alone is conceived to contain them all, though the graves in which their bodies were deposited, might be innumerable. Again, in the song of triumph on the fall of the king of Babylon⁶⁰, *Hell* (the original word is the same as in the preceding passage) *from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth: it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations.* Thus, in *hades*, all the monarchs and nobles, not of one family or race, but of the whole earth, are assembled. Yet their sepulchres are as distant from one another as the nations they governed. Those mighty dead are raised, not from their couches, which would have been the natural expression, had the Prophet's idea been a sepulchral vault, how magnificent soever, but *from their thrones*, as suited the notion of all antiquity, concerning not the bodies, but the shades or ghosts of the departed, to which was always assigned something similar in rank and

⁵⁹ Isa. v. 14.

⁶⁰ xiv. 9.

occupation to what they had possessed upon the earth. Nay, as is well observed by Castalio⁶¹, those are represented as in hades, whose carcasses were denied the honours of sepulture. In this particular, the opinions of the Hebrews did not coincide with those of the Greeks and Romans.

§ 9. To the preceding examples, I shall add but one other from the Old Testament. It is taken from that beautiful passage in Job⁶², wherein God himself is the speaker, and whereof the great purpose is, to expose human ignorance, and check human presumption. *Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? or hast thou seen the doors of the shadow of death?* For this last designation the term is in Hebrew *tsalmoth*, and in the translation of the Seventy, *ἀδης*: for, as was hinted before, *tsalmoth*, in its ordinary acceptance, is synonymous with *sheol*, though sometimes used metaphorically, for a very dark place, or a state of great ignorance. It is almost too obvious to need being remarked, that this challenge to Job could have no relation to a sepulchre, the door, or entry to which, is always known to the living. The case was very different with regard to the habitation of departed spirits. At the same time, I entirely agree with the learned and ingenious bishop Lowth⁶³, that the custom of

⁶¹ Defensio adv. Bezam. Adversarii Errores.

⁶² Job, xxxviii. 17.

⁶³ De sacra Poesi Hebræorum, Præl. vii.

depositing under ground the bodies of the deceased, and the form of their sepulchres, have, probably, first suggested some gloomy notions on this subject. But popular opinions have a growth and progress, and come often, especially in questions at once so interesting and so inscrutable, to differ widely from what they were originally. May we not then, upon the whole, fairly conclude, that we have all the evidence which the nature of the thing will admit, and more than, in most philological inquiries, is thought sufficient, that the word *grave* or *sepulchre* never conveys the full import of the Hebrew *sheol*, or the Greek *hades*, though, in some instances, it may have all the precision necessary for giving the import of the sentiment?

§ 10. EVEN in some instances, where the language is so figurative, as to allow great latitude to a translator, the original term is but weakly rendered *grave*. Thus it is said⁶⁴, *Love is strong as death, jealousy is cruel as the grave*. The *grave*, when personified; or used metaphorically, is more commonly, if I mistake not, exhibited as a gentle power, which brings relief from cruelty, oppression, and trouble of every kind; whereas *hades*, which regards more the state of departed souls, than the mansions of their bodies, exhibits, when personified, a severe and inflexible jailor, who is not to be gained by the most pathetic entreaties, or by any arts merely human. The

⁶⁴ Cant. viii. 6.

clause would be appositely rendered in Latin, *inexorabilis sicut orcus* : for it is this inflexibility of character, that is chiefly indicated by the original word rendered *cruel*. In this notion of that state, as indeed in some other sentiments on this subject, and even in the terms applied to it, there is a pretty close coincidence with those of the ancient Pagans. When the Latin poet mentions the fatal consequence of the venial trespass of Orpheus (as it appeared to him) in turning about to take one look of his beloved Eurydice, before leaving the infernal regions, he says, *Ignoscenda quidem* ; but immediately correcting himself, adds, *scirent si ignoscere manes*.

§ 11. I SHALL NOW proceed to examine some passages in the New Testament, wherein the word occurs, that we may discover whether we ought to affix the same idea to it as to the corresponding term in the Old.—The first I shall produce is one, which, being originally in the Old Testament, is quoted and commented on in the New, and is consequently one of the fittest for assisting us in the discovery. Peter, in supporting the mission of his Master, in a speech made to the inhabitants of Judea and Jerusalem, on the famous day of Pentecost, alleges, amongst other things, the prediction of the royal Psalmist, part of which runs thus in the common version⁶⁵ : *Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.*

⁶⁵ Acts, ii. 27.

The passage is cited from the Psalms⁶⁶, in the very words of the Seventy, which are (as far as concerns the present question) entirely conformable to the original Hebrew. As this prophecy might be understood by some to relate only to the Psalmist himself, the Apostle shows how inapplicable it is to him, when literally explained. It plainly pointed to a resurrection, and such a resurrection as would very soon follow death, that the soul should not be left in hades, should not remain in the mansion of departed spirits, but should reanimate its body, before the latter had suffered corruption. *Brethren*⁶⁷, says he, *let me speak freely to you of the Patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us to this day.* He has had no resurrection. It was never pretended that he had. His body, like other bodies, has undergone corruption; and this gives sufficient reason to believe that his soul has shared the fate of other souls, and that the prophecy was never meant of him, unless in a secondary sense. *But*⁶⁸, continues he, *being a prophet, he spake of the resurrection of Christ, or the Messiah: and, to shew how exactly both what related to the soul, and what related to the body, had their completion in the Messiah, adds, that his soul was not left in hades, neither did his flesh see corruption.* It has been argued, that this is an example of the figure *εν δια δυοιν*, where the same sentiment is expressed a second time by a

⁶⁶ Psal. xvi. 10.⁶⁷ Acts, ii. 29.⁶⁸ 30, 31.

different phrase. In some sense this may be admitted; for, no doubt, either of the expressions would have served for predicting the event. But it is enough for my purpose, that the writer, in using two, one regarding the soul, the other regarding the body, would undoubtedly adapt his language to the received opinions concerning each. And if so, *hades* was as truly, in their account, the soul's destiny after death, as corruption was the body's.

§ 12. I AM surprized, that a man of Dr. Taylor's critical abilities, as well as Oriental literature, should produce the passage quoted by the Apostle, as an example to prove that *sheol*, *the pit*, *death*, and *corruption*, are synonymous. The expression, as we read it in the Psalm, is (to say the least) no evidence of this; but if we admit Peter to have been a just interpreter of the Psalmist's meaning, which father Simon seems very unwilling to admit, it contains a strong evidence of the contrary: for, in his comment, he clearly distinguishes the destiny of the *soul*, which is to be consigned to *sheol* or *hades*, from that of the *body* or *flesh*, which is to be consigned to *corruption*. Nor is there, in this, the slightest appearance of an unusual or mystical application of the words. The other examples brought by that author, in his very valuable Hebrew Concordance, are equally exceptionable.

He proceeds on the supposition, that no account can be given, why certain phrases are often found coupled together, but by saying that they

are synonymous : whereas, in the present case, it is much more naturally accounted for, by saying, that the events to which they relate, are commonly concomitant. We ought never to recur to tautology for the solution of a difficulty, unless when the ordinary application of the words admits no other resource. This is far from being the case in the instances referred to. Of the like kind are the arguments founded on such figurative expressions, as, digging into *hades* ; Korah's descending alive into it ; Jonah's being there, when in the belly of the great fish ; the foundations of the mountains, or the roots of the trees, reaching to it ; which are all evident hyperboles, and to which we find expressions entirely similar in ancient authors. Thus, Virgil, describing the storm in which Æneas was involved at sea, says,

Tollimur in cœlum, curvato gurgite, et iidem
Subductâ ad manes imos descendimus undâ.

Again, speaking of an oak,

Ipsa hæret scopulis ; et quantum vertice ad auras
Æthereas, tantum radice in Tartara tendit.

Yet, these figures, as far as I have heard, have never created any doubt among critics, concerning the ordinary acceptation of the words *tartarus* and *imi manes*. No pretence has been made that the one ever meant, when used not tropically, but

properly, the bottom of the sea, and the other a few yards under ground. Indeed, if a man were to employ the same mode of reasoning, in regard to the Latin terms that relate to this subject, which has been employed, in regard to the Hebrew; we should conclude, that *sepulchrum* and *infernus* are synonymous, *anima* and *corpus*, *manes* and *cinis*, upon evidence incomparably stronger than that we have for inferring, that *sheol* and *keber* are so. Of the first two the Latin poet says, *Animamque sepulchro condimus*. If *anima* be here used for *the soul*, agreeably to its ordinary and proper acceptation, he assigns it the same habitation as is given to the body after death, to wit, the *sepulchre*: and if it be used for *the body*, the words *corpus* and *anima* are strangely confounded, even by the best writers. As we have *anima* here for *corpus*, we have, in other places, *corpus* for *anima*. For, speaking of Charon's ferrying the souls of the deceased over Styx, he says,

Et ferrugineâ subvectat corpora cymbâ.

Now, what Virgil here calls *corpora*, and a few lines after, more explicitly, *defunctaque corpora vita*, he had a very little before expressed by a phrase of the contrary import, *tenues sine corpore vitas*, the one being *the body without the life*, the other *the life without the body*. That *cinis* and *manes* are in like manner confounded, we have an example from the same author:

Id cinerem, aut manes credis curare sepultos?

Here, if *sepultos* mean *buried*, *cinis* and *manes* are synonymous: if *manes* mean *ghosts*, then *sepultos* is equivalent to *deductos ad infernum*. Yet it would not be easy to say to what trope the author has, in these instances, had recourse, if it be not the catachresis. Nor is this promiscuous application of the words peculiar to the poets. Livy, the historian, uses the word *manes* in prose with equal latitude. *Sepulchra diruta, nudati manes*.

To these instances of confusion in the meanings of the words mentioned, nothing parallel has been alleged from the Hebrew Scriptures, except only that שׁוֹנֵן sometimes, like *anima* in the example above quoted, means *a dead body*. Yet nobody considers the examples aforesaid as invalidating those distinctions in Latin, which an usage incomparably more extensive has established in the language. With much less reason then can a few expressions, confessedly hyperbolic and figurative, be pleaded for subverting the uniform acceptation of the Hebrew words in question, in their proper and natural application. Taylor's remark, that *keber* grave, is one particular cavity, &c. and that *sheol* is a collective name for all the graves, &c. tends more to perplex the subject than to explain it. He would hardly be thought to apprehend distinctly the import of the Latin words, who should define them by telling us, that *sepulchrum* is one particular cavity digged for the interment of a dead person, and that *infernus* is a collective name for all the *sepulchra*, &c.

The definition would be both obscure and unjust; yet, from what has been shewn, more might be produced to justify it, than can be advanced in vindication of the other.

§ 13. BESIDES, we have another clear proof from the New Testament, that *hades* denotes the intermediate state of souls between death and the general resurrection. In the Apocalypse⁶⁹, we learn that *death and hades*, by our translators rendered *hell* as usual, *shall*, immediately after the general judgment, *be cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.* In other words, the death which consists in the separation of the soul from the body, and the state of souls intervening between death and judgment, shall be no more. To the wicked, these shall be succeeded by a more terrible death, the damnation of gehenna, *hell* properly so called. Indeed, in this sacred Book, the commencement as well as the destruction of this intermediate state, are so clearly marked, as to render it almost impossible to mistake them. In a preceding chapter⁷⁰, we learn that *hades* follows close at the heels of death; and, from the other passage quoted, that both are involved in one common ruin, at the universal judgment. Whereas, if we interpret *ἀδης hell*, in the Christian sense of the word, the whole passage is rendered nonsense. *Hell* is represented as being cast into *hell*: for so the lake of fire, which is, in this place, also denominated the second death, is universally interpreted.

⁶⁹ xx. 14.

⁷⁰ vi. 8.

§ 14. THE Apostle Paul, without naming *hades*, conveys to us the same idea of the state of souls departed⁷¹. *The righteousness which is of faith, speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above;) or, who shall descend into the deep? εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον* into the abyss, (*that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead*)—in other words, faith does not require, for our satisfaction, things impracticable, either to scale the heavens, or to explore the profound recesses of departed spirits. The word here used shows this. It is *ἀβύσσος*, that is, a pit or gulph, if not bottomless, at least, of an indeterminable depth. The very antithesis of descending into the deep, and ascending into heaven, also shows it. There would be a most absurd disparity in the different members of this illustration, if no more were to be understood by the abyss than the grave, since nothing is more practicable for the living than a descent thither. The women, who went to visit our Lord's sepulchre, did actually descend into it⁷². Besides, to call the grave *the abyss*, is entirely unexampled. Let it be also observed, that it is not said *to bring Christ up from the grave*, but *from the dead*, *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, for which end, to bring back the soul is, in the first place, necessary. I do not say that the Greek word *ἀβύσσος*, or the corresponding Hebrew word *תְּהוֹם* *thehom*, is confined to the signification here given it. I know that it often means the ocean, because conceived

⁷¹ Rom. x. 6, 7.⁷² Mark, xvi. 5. Luke, xxiv. 3.

to be of an unfathomable depth, and may indeed be applied to any thing of which the same quality can be affirmed.

§ 15. So much for the literal sense of the word *hades*, which, as has been observed, implies properly neither *hell* nor the *grave*, but the place or state of departed souls. I know that it has been said, and speciously supported, that, in the Mosaical economy, there was no express revelation of the existence of souls after death. Admitting this to be in some sense true, the Israelites were not without such intimations of a future state as types, and figures, and emblematical predictions, could give them: yet certain it is, that life and immortality were, in an eminent manner, brought to light only by the Gospel. But, from whatever source they derived their opinions, that they had opinions on this subject, though dark and confused, is manifest, as from many other circumstances, so particularly from the practice of witchcraft and necromancy, which prevailed among them, and the power they ascribed to sorcerers, justly or unjustly, it matters not, of evoking the ghosts of the deceased.

The whole story of the witch of Endor⁷³, is an irrefragable evidence of this. For, however much people may differ, in their manner of explaining the phenomena which it presents to us; judicious and impartial men, whose minds are not pre-occu-

⁷³ 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, &c.

plied with a system, can hardly differ as to the evidence it affords, that the existence of spirits, in a separate state, was an article of the popular belief, and that it was thought possible, by certain secret arts, to maintain an intercourse with them. Our question here is not, what was expressly revealed to that people on this subject? but, what appear to have been the notions commonly entertained concerning it? or, what it was which the learned Bishop of London styles⁷⁴, the *infernum poeticum* of the Hebrews? Indeed, the artifices employed by their wizards and necromancers, alluded to by Isaiah, of returning answers in a feigned voice, which appeared to those present, as proceeding from under the ground⁷⁵, is a demonstration of the prevalency of the sentiments I have been illustrating, in regard both to the existence, and to the abode of souls departed. For that these were the oracles intended to be consulted, is manifest from the Prophet's upbraiding them with it, as an absurdity, that the living should recur for counsel, not to their God, but to the dead. It is well expressed in Houbigant's translation, *Itane pro vivis mortui interrogantur*⁷⁶. But what can be clearer to this purpose than the law itself, whereby such practices are prohibited?⁷⁷ *There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of*

⁷⁴ Notes on ch. xiii. and xiv. of Isaiah.

⁷⁵ Isa. xxix. 4.

⁷⁶ Isa. viii. 19.

⁷⁷ Deut. xviii. 10, 11.

times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. This last character is not expressed in the original, as in the English translation, by a single word, but by a periphrasis, **doresh el hamathim** רִשׁ אֵל הַמַּתִּים, which, rendered literally, is, *one who consulteth the dead*. It is accordingly translated by the Seventy **επερωτων τους νεκρους**, and by Houbigant. *Qui mortuos interroget.*

From the narrative of what passed at Endor, it may be observed that, in whatever way the facts are accounted for by expositors, as to which I am not inquiring, it was evidently believed, at the time, not only that the evocation of the spirits of the deceased was possible, but that the spirit of Samuel was actually evoked. Of this Saul, who consulted him, appears to have had no doubt. Nay more, the sacred penmen who records their conversation, appears as little doubtful as the king. *And Saul, says he, perceived that it was Samuel. And Samuel said—*The son of Sirach also, who is thought to have written two centuries before the Christian era, expresses himself, on this topic, with the same unhesitating confidence. To a brief account of Samuel's life and character he subjoins⁷⁸—*And after his death he prophesied, and showed the king his end, and lift up his voice from the earth in prophecy, to blot out the wickedness of the people.* In like manner Josephus, a contemporary of the apostles, relates the story,

⁷⁸ Ecclus. xlvi. 20.

without betraying the smallest suspicion, that it was not the soul of Samuel who, on that occasion, conversed with Saul ⁷⁹. So that, whatever was the real case, we are warranted to conclude, that the reality of such appearances after death, and consequently of such a state of departed spirits as above described, were standing articles in the popular creed of the Jewish nation.

§ 16. I SHALL add a few things in regard to the metaphorical use of the term. I have observed that *heaven* and *hades* are commonly set in opposition to each other; the one is conceived to be the highest object, the other the lowest. From what is literally or locally so, the transition is very natural (insomuch that we find traces of it in all languages) to what is figuratively so; that is, what expresses a glorious and happy state on the one hand, or a humble and miserable state on the other. In this way it is used by our Lord ⁸⁰, *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shall be brought down to hades, εως αδου*. As the city of Capernaum was never literally raised to *heaven*, we have no reason to believe that it was to be literally brought down to *hades*. But as, by the former expression, we are given to understand, that it was become a flourishing and splendid city, or, as some think, that it had obtained great spiritual advantages; so, by the

⁷⁹ Antiq. l. vi. c. 15.

⁸⁰ Matth. xi. 23.

latter, that it should be brought to the lowest degree of abasement and wretchedness.

§ 17. ANOTHER passage, in which the application of the word is figurative, we have in that celebrated promise made to Peter⁸¹, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell, πύλαι ᾠδου*, the gates of hades, shall not prevail against it. It is by death, and by it only, that the spirit enters into *hades*. The gate of *hades* is therefore a very natural periphrasis for death; insomuch that, without any positive evidence, we should naturally conclude this to be the meaning of the phrase. But we have sufficient evidence, both sacred and profane, that this is the meaning. The phrase occurs in the Septuagint, in the thanksgiving of Hezekiah, after his miraculous recovery from the mortal disease he had been seized with⁸². I said, *I shall go to the gates of the grave, εν πύλαις ᾠδου*. It follows, *I am deprived of the residue of my years*. Nothing can be plainer than that πύλαι ᾠδου here means *death*, in other words, I shall die and be deprived of the residue of my years. But, though the phrase is the same (for πύλαι ᾠδου is a literal version of the Hebrew) with that used by our Lord, our translators have not liked to make Hezekiah, who was a good man, speak as if he thought himself going to hell, and have therefore rendered it *the grave*.

⁸¹ Matth. xvi. 13.

⁸² Isaiah, xxxviii. 10.

* περιφρασις θανάτου, ἡχοφ. Νελ. in
 ἡχοφ. Νελ.

Another example we have in the Wisdom of Solomon, which, though not canonical Scripture, is, in a question of criticism, a good authority⁸³. *Thou hast power of life and death, thou leadest to the gates of hades, εις πυλας ᾠδου, and bringest up again.* This passage is as little susceptible of doubt as the former. The classical use of this phrase is the same with that of the inspired writers. Homer makes Achilles say, as rendered by our English poet⁸⁴:

Who can think one thing, and another tell,
My soul detests him as the gates of hell:

—εικος αιδαο πυλησι

that is, I hate him as death, or I hate him mortally. To say then that the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against the church, is, in other words, to say, It shall never die, it shall never be extinct. Le Clerc, though meaning the same thing (as appears by his note,) has expressed it inaccurately: “Les portes de la mort ne la surmonteront point;” *The gates of death shall not surmount it.* We see at once how appositely *death* is called *the gate of hades*. But what should we call the gates of death? Not death itself, surely. They must be *diseases*; for by these we are brought to death. But in this sense we cannot apply the promise. For many direful diseases has the church been afflicted with, if the introduction

⁸³ xvi. 13.

⁸⁴ Iliad B.

of the grossest errors, the most superstitious practices, and senseless disputes, are to be accounted such; but they have not hitherto proved mortal, and, we have reason to believe, never shall.

§ 18. IN the exclamation adopted by the Apostle⁸⁵, *O death where is thy sting? O grave, ἄδη, where is thy victory?* we cannot say so properly, that the words *death* and *hades* are used figuratively, as the words *sting* and *victory*, with which they are accompanied. In regard to the sense, there can be no doubt. It is manifestly the Apostle's view to signify that, whatever might have been formerly an object of terror in either *death* or *hades*, is removed by Jesus Christ, inso-much that in these very things the true disciples find matter of joy and exultation.

§ 19. BUT is there not one passage, it may be said, in which the word *ἄδης* must be understood as synonymous with *γεεννα*, and consequently must denote the place of final punishment prepared for the wicked, or *hell*, in the Christian acceptance of the term? You have it in the story of the rich man and Lazarus⁸⁶. *In hell, εν τῷ ἄδη, he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.* This is the only passage in holy writ which seems to give countenance to the opinion that *ἄδης* sometimes means the same

⁸⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 55.

⁸⁶ Luke, xvi. 23.

thing as *γεεννα*. Here it is represented as a place of punishment. The rich man is said to be tormented there, in the midst of flames. These things will deserve to be examined narrowly. It is plain that, in the Old Testament, the most profound silence is observed, in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery. It is represented to us rather by negative qualities than by positive, by its silence, its darkness, its being inaccessible, unless by preternatural means, to the living, and their ignorance about it. Thus much, in general, seems always to have been presumed concerning it, that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad. In most respects, however, there was a resemblance, in their notions on this subject, to those of the most ancient heathens.

But the opinions, neither of Hebrews nor of heathens, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially, from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a closer intercourse with pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews, in our Saviour's time, from those which prevailed, in the days of the ancient

prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible, both of enjoyment, and of suffering; they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the pagan fables, on this subject, nor did they express themselves, entirely, in the same manner; but the general train of thinking, in both, came pretty much to coincide. The Greek *hades* they found well adapted to express the Hebrew *sheol*. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations, for ghosts of different characters. And, though they did not receive the terms *Elysium*, or *Elysian fields*, as suitable appellations for the regions peopled by good spirits, they took, instead of them, as better adapted to their own theology, *the garden of Eden*, or *Paradise*, a name originally Persian, by which the word answering to *garden*, especially when applied to Eden, had commonly been rendered, by the Seventy. To denote the same state, they sometimes used the phrase *Abraham's bosom*, a metaphor borrowed from the manner in which they reclined at meals. But, on the other hand, to express the unhappy situation of the wicked, in that intermediate state, they do not seem to have declined the use of the word *tartarus*. The Apostle Peter, says⁸⁷ of evil angels, that *God cast them down to hell, and*

⁸⁷ 2 Peter, ii. 4.

delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. So it stands in the common version, though neither *γεεννα* nor *ἀδης* are in the original, where the expression is, *σειραις ζοφου ταρταρωσας παρεδωκεν εις κρισιν τετηρημενους.* The word is not *γεεννα*; for that comes after judgment; but *ταρταρος*, which is, as it were, the prison of hades, wherein criminals are kept till the general judgment. And as, in the ordinary use of the Greek word, it was comprehended under *hades*, as a part; it ought, unless we had some positive reason to the contrary, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, to be understood so here. There is, then, no inconsistency in maintaining, that the rich man, though in torments, was not in *gehenna*, but in that part of *hades* called *tartarus*, where we have seen already, that spirits reserved for judgment are detained in darkness.

That there is, in a lower degree, a reward of the righteous, and a punishment of the wicked, in the state intervening between death and the resurrection, is no more repugnant to the divine perfections, than that there should be (as, in the course of providence, there often are) manifest recompenses of eminent virtues, and of enormous crimes, in the present world. Add to this, that Josephus, in the account he gives of the opinions of the Pharisees, or those Jews who believed a future state, mentions expressly the rewards of the virtuous, and the punishments of the vicious, in *hades*, or under the earth, which is, as was observed before, another expression for the same

thing⁸⁸. From his representation we should conclude, that, in his time, a resurrection and future judgment, as understood by the Christians, were not universally the doctrine, even of the Pharisees; but, that the prevalent and distinguishing opinion was, that the soul survived the body, that vicious souls would suffer an everlasting imprisonment in *hades*, and that the souls of the virtuous would both be happy there, and, in process of time, obtain the privilege of transmigrating into other bodies. The immortality of human souls, and the transmigration of the good, seem to have been all that they comprehended in the phrase

⁸⁸ *Αθανατον τε ισχυν ταις ψυχαις πιστις αυτοις ειναι, και υπο χθονος δικαιωσεις τε και τιμας οίς αρετης η κακιας επιτηδευεις εν τω βιω γεγονε, και ταις μεν ειργμον αιδιον προστιθεσθαι, ταις δε ραδτωνην του αναβιονν. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 2. Ψυχην δε πασαν μεν αφθαρτον μεταβαινειν δε εις ετερον σωμα, την των αγαθών μονην την δε των φαυλων, άδιω τιμωρια κολαζεσθαι. Bell. Lib. ii. c. 12. 'Ετερον σωμα is an expression by no means parallel, as Dr. Jennings seems to have thought [Jewish Antiquities, B. i. c. 10.] to that used of our Lord's transfiguration [Luke, ix. 29.] το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ετερον. Ειδος is no more than the appearance. Now, to say that the body into which the soul passes is another body: and to say that it has another appearance, are two expressions which no person who reflects, will confound as equivalent. That there are some things, however, which would lead one to infer that the opinions of the Pharisees, on this article, were more conformable to the Christian doctrine, than is implied in the words of Josephus, is not to be dissembled. But the difficulty resulting hence, is more easily removed by admitting, what is nowise improbable, that there was not then, among them, an exact uniformity of opinion, than by recurring, on either side, to a mode of criticism which the language will not bear.*

αναστασις των νεκρων. Indeed, the words strictly denote no more than the renewal of life.

Their sentiments on this topic naturally recal to our remembrance some of those exhibited by Virgil, in the sixth book of the *Æneid*. That this Pythagorean dogma was become pretty general, among the Jews, appears even from some passages in the Gospels. The question put by the disciples⁸⁹, *Who sinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?* and some popular opinions concerning Jesus, whom they knew to have been born, and brought up, among themselves, that he was Elijah, or Jeremiah, or one of the ancient Prophets⁹⁰, manifestly presuppose the doctrine of the transmigration. It is also, in allusion to this, that the Jewish author of the book of Wisdom, has, as it is rendered in the common translation, thus expressed himself: *I was a witty child, and had a good spirit; yea, rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled: αγαθος ων, ηλθον εις σωμα αμιαντον*⁹¹. Yet we have reason, from the New Testament, to think that these tenets were not, at that time, universal among the Pharisees, but that some entertained juster notions of a resurrection, and that afterwards, the opinions of the Talmudists, on this article, had a much greater conformity to the doctrine of the Gospel, than the opinions of some of their predecessors in, and before, our Saviour's time.

⁸⁹ John, ix. 2.

⁹⁰ Matth. xvi. 14.

⁹¹ Wisd. viii. 19, 20.

§ 20. ACCORDING to this explication, the rich man and Lazarus were both in *hades*, though in very different situations, the latter in the mansions of the happy, and the former in those of the wretched. Both are comprehended under the same general name. In the conversation lately quoted between Saul and the ghost of Samuel, the prophet, amongst other things, said to the king, *Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me*⁹², which does not imply that their condition would be the same, though each would have his place in the receptacle of departed spirits. Let us see how the circumstances mentioned, and the expressions used, in the parable, will suit this hypothesis. First, though they are said to be at a great distance from each other, they are still within sight and hearing, so as to be able to converse together. This would have been too gross a violation of probability, if the one were considered as inhabiting the highest heavens, and the other as placed in the infernal regions. Again, the expressions used are such as entirely suit this explanation, and no other; for first, the distance from each other is mentioned, but no hint that the one was higher in situation than the other; secondly, the terms whereby motion from the one to the other is expressed, are such as are never employed in expressing motion to, or from heaven, but always when the places are on a level, or nearly so. Thus; Lazarus, when dead, is said⁹³

⁹² 1 Sam. xxviii. 19.

⁹³ Luke, xvi. 22.

απενεχθῆναι, to be carried away, not *ανενεχθῆναι*, to be carried up, by angels, into Abraham's bosom; whereas, it is the latter of these, or one similarly compounded, that is always used, where an assumption into heaven is spoken of. Thus, the same writer, in speaking of our Lord's ascension, says⁹⁴ *ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον*, and Mark⁹⁵, in relation to the same event, says, *ανεληφθη εις τον ουρανον*, he was taken up into heaven. These words are also used, wherever one is said to be conveyed from a lower to a higher situation. But, what is still more decisive in this way, where mention is made of passing from Abraham to the rich man, and inversely, the verbs employed are, *διαβαινω* and *διαπεραω*, words which always denote motion on the same ground or level; as, passing a river or lake, passing through the Red Sea, or passing from Asia into Macedonia. But, when heaven is spoken of as the termination to which, or from which, the passage is made, the word is, invariably, either in the first case, *αναβαινω*, and in the second, *καταβαινω*, or some word similarly formed, and of the same import. Thus, both the circumstances of the story, and the expressions employed in it, confirm the explanation I have given. For, if the sacred penmen wrote to be understood, they must have employed their words and phrases, in conformity to the current usage of those for whom they wrote.

⁹⁴ xxiv. 51.⁹⁵ Mark, xvi. 19.

§ 21. WHEN our Saviour, therefore, said to the penitent thief upon the cross⁹⁶, *To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise*; he said nothing that contradicts what is affirmed of his descent into *hades*, in the Psalms, in the Acts, or in the Apostles' creed. *Paradise* is another name for what is, in the parable, called Abraham's bosom. But it may be urged on the other side, that Paul has given some reason to conclude that paradise and heaven, or the seat of the glorious hierarchy, are the same. *It is not*, says he⁹⁷, *expedient for me doubtless to glory: I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth,) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth,) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.* The Jews make mention of three heavens. The first is properly the atmosphere where the birds fly, and the clouds are suspended. The second is above the first, and is what we call the visible firmament, wherein the sun, moon, and stars appear. The third, to us invisible, is conceived to be above the second, and therefore sometimes styled the heaven of heavens. This they considered as the place of the throne of God, and the habitation of the holy angels. Now it is evident that, if, in the second

⁹⁶ Luke, xxiii. 43.

⁹⁷ 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

and fourth verses, he speak of one vision or revelation only, paradise and heaven are the same; not so, if, in these, he speak of two different revelations. My opinion is, that there are two, and I shall assign my reasons. First, he speaks of them as more than one, and that not only in introducing them, *I will come to visions and revelations*; for sometimes it must be owned, that the plural is used in expressing a subject indefinitely; but afterwards, in referring to what he had related, he says⁹⁸ *lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, των αποκαλυψεων*. Secondly, they are related precisely as two distinct events, and coupled together by the connexive particle. Thirdly, there is a repetition of his doubts⁹⁹, in regard to the reality of his translation, which, if the whole relate to a single event, was not only superfluous, but improper. This repetition, however, was necessary, if what is related in the third and fourth verses, be a different fact from what is told in the second, and if he was equally uncertain, whether it passed in vision or in reality. Fourthly, if all the three verses regard only one revelation, there is, in the manner of relating it, a tautology unexampled in the Apostle's writings. I might urge, as a fifth reason, the opinion of all Christian antiquity, Origen alone excepted. And this, in a question of philology, is not without its weight.

I shall only add, that, though, in both verses, the words in the English Bible are *caught up*,

⁹⁸ Verse, 7.

⁹⁹ Verse, 2, 3.

there is nothing in the original answering to the particle *up*. The Apostle has very properly employed here the word *αρπαζω*, expressive more of the suddenness of the event, and of his own passiveness, than of the direction of the motion¹⁰⁰. The only other place in which *παραδεισος* occurs is in the Apocalypse¹⁰¹. *To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst του παραδεισού of the paradise of God.* Here our Lord, no doubt, speaks of heaven, but, as he plainly alludes to the state of matters in the garden of Eden, where our first parents were placed, and where the tree of life grew, it can only be understood as a figurative expression of the promise of eternal life, forfeited by Adam, but recovered by our Lord Jesus Christ.

§ 22. To conclude this long discussion, I shall observe that, though we may discover hence,

¹⁰⁰ The learned reader may peruse the following passage from Epiphanius on this subject, in opposition to Origen. Ουδε ο αποστολος υποτιθεται τον παραδεισον ειναι εν τριτω ουρανω, τοις λεπτων ακροασθαι λογων επισταμενοις· οίδα γαρ αρπαγεντα εως τριτου λεγων ουρανου. και οίδα τον τοιοντον ανθρωπον, ειτε εν σωματι, ειτε χωρις σωματος, ο θεος οιδεν, οτι ηρπαγη εις τον παραδεισον. δυο αποκαλυψεις μεγαλας εωρακεναι μηνυει, δις αναληφθεις εναργως, απαξ μεν εως τριτου ουρανου, απαξ δε εις τον παραδεισον. το γαρ οίδα αρπαγεντα τον τοιοντον εως τριτου ουρανου, ιδιως αποκαλυψιν αυτω κατα τον τριτον αναληφθεντι πεφηνηναι συνιστησι. το δε, και οίδα παλιν επιφορομενον τον τοιοντον ανθρωπον, ειτε εν σωματι, ειτε εκτος του σωματος, εις τον παραδεισον, ετεραν αυθις αυτω πεφανερωσθαι κατα τον παραδεισον αποκαλυψιν δεικνυσι. Epiph. Lib. ii. Hær. 44.

¹⁰¹ Rev. ii. 7.

pretty exactly, the general sentiments entertained on these subjects, at the time, and the style used concerning them; we are not to imagine that the expressions are to be rigorously interpreted, in order to come at the true doctrine, upon these articles, but solely, in order to discover the popular opinions of the age. In regard to these, the opinions of the age, there ought to be a close attention to the letter of what is spoken; but, in regard to the other, the doctrine of holy writ, our attention ought to be mostly to the spirit. Thus it appears to me the plain doctrine of Scripture, that there are such states as I have mentioned, and that the use and nature of them is such as has been said. That it was, for ages, the doctrine of all the ancient ecclesiastical writers, is not less evident. But in respect of situation, expressions implying that *hades* is under the earth, and that the seat of the blessed is above the stars, ought to be regarded merely, as attempts to accommodate what is spoken to vulgar apprehension and language. Of the like kind is the practice, so frequent in holy writ, of ascribing human passions, nay, and human organs and members, to the Deity. The same may be said of what we hear of plants and trees, in paradise, of eating and drinking in heaven, or of fire and brimstone, in either *hades* or *gehenna*. We have no more reason to understand these literally, than we have to believe that the soul, when separated from the body, can feel torment in its tongue, or that a little cold water can relieve it.

§ 23. I AM not ignorant that the doctrine of an intermediate state between death and the resurrection, has been of late strenuously combatted, by some learned and ingenious men; amongst whom we must reckon that excellent divine and firm friend to freedom of inquiry, Dr. Law, the present bishop of Carlisle¹⁰². I honour his disposition, and have the greatest respect for his talents; but at the same time that I acknowledge he has, with much ability, supported the side he has espoused, I have never felt myself, on this head, convinced, though sometimes perplexed, by his reasoning. It is foreign to my purpose to enter into a minute discussion of controverted points in theology; and therefore I shall only, in passing, make a few remarks on this controversy, as it is closely connected with my subject.

First, I remark that the arguments on which the deniers of that state chiefly build, arise, in my opinion, from a misapprehension of the import of some scriptural expressions. *Καθευδειν, κοιμῶν*, *to sleep*, are words often applied to the *dead*; but this application is no more than a metaphorical euphemism derived from the resemblance which a dead body bears to the body of a person asleep. Traces of this idiom may be found in all languages, whatever be the popular belief about the state of the dead. They often occur in the Old Testament; yet it has been shown that the common doctrine of the Orientals

¹⁰² Dr. Law was living when the first edition of these Dissertations was in the hands of the printer.

favoured the separate existence of the souls of the deceased. But, if it did not, and if, as some suppose, the ancient Jews were, on all articles relating to another life, no better than Sadducees; this shows the more strongly, that such metaphors, so frequent in their writings, could be derived solely from bodily likeness, and having no reference to a resurrection, could be employed solely for the sake of avoiding a disagreeable or ominous word. I own, at the same time, that Christians have been the more ready to adopt such expressions, as their doctrine of the resurrection of the body, presented to their minds an additional analogy between the bodies of the deceased, and the bodies of those asleep, that of being one day awaked. But I see no reason to imagine that, in this use, they carried their thoughts further than to the corporeal and visible resemblance now mentioned. Another mistake about the import of scriptural terms, is in the sense which has been given to the word *αναστασις*. They confine it by a use derived merely from modern European tongues, to that renovation which we call the reunion of the soul and the body, and which is to take place at the last day. I have shown, in another place¹⁰³, that this is not always the sense of the term in the New Testament.

I remark, secondly, that many expressions of scripture, in the natural and obvious sense, imply that an intermediate and separate state of the soul

¹⁰³ Notes on Matth. xxii. 23. and 32.

is actually to succeed death. Such are the words of our Lord to the penitent thief upon the cross¹⁰⁴, Stephen's dying petition¹⁰⁵, the comparisons which the Apostle Paul makes in different places¹⁰⁶, between the enjoyment which true Christians can attain by their continuance in this world, and that which they enter on at their departure out of it, and several other passages. Let the words referred to be read by any judicious person, either in the original, or in the common translation, which is sufficiently exact for this purpose ; and let him, setting aside all theory or system, say candidly, whether they would not be understood, by the gross of mankind, as presupposing that the soul may, and will, exist separately from the body, and be susceptible of happiness or misery in that state. If any thing could add to the native evidence of the expressions, it would be the unnatural meanings that are put upon them, in order to disguise that evidence. What shall we say of the metaphysical distinction introduced, for this purpose, between absolute, and relative, time ? The Apostle Paul, they are sensible, speaks of the saints as admitted to enjoyment, in the presence of God, immediately after death. Now, to palliate the direct contradiction there is in this to their doctrine, that the vital principle, which is all they mean by the soul, remains extinguished between death and the resurrection, they remind us of the

¹⁰⁴ Luke, xxiii. 43.

¹⁰⁵ Acts, vii. 59.

¹⁰⁶ 2 Cor. v. 6, &c. Philip. i. 21, &c.

difference there is between absolute or real, and relative or apparent, time. They admit that, if the Apostle be understood as speaking of real time, what is said flatly contradicts their system; but, say they, his words must be interpreted as spoken, only of apparent time. He talks indeed of entering on a state of enjoyment, immediately after death, though there may be many thousands of years between the one and the other; for, he means only, that when that state shall commence, however distant in reality the time may be, the person entering on it will not be sensible of that distance, and consequently there will be to him an apparent coincidence with the moment of his death. But, does the Apostle any where hint that this is his meaning? or, is it what any man would naturally discover from his words? That it is exceedingly remote from the common use of language, I believe hardly any of those who favour this scheme, will be partial enough to deny. Did the sacred penmen then mean to put a cheat upon the world, and, by the help of an equivocal expression, to flatter men with the hope of entering, the instant they expire, on a state of felicity; when, in fact, they knew that it would be many ages before it would take place? But, were the hypothesis about the extinction of the mind between death and the resurrection well founded, the apparent coincidence they speak of, is not so clear as they seem to think it. For my part, I cannot regard it as an axiom, and I never heard of any who attempted to demonstrate it. To me it appears merely a corollary

from Mr. Locke's doctrine, which derives our conceptions of time from the succession of our ideas, which, whether true or false, is a doctrine to be found only among certain philosophers, and which, we may reasonably believe, never came into the heads of those to whom the gospel, in the apostolic age, was announced.

I remark, thirdly, that even the curious equivocation, (or, perhaps more properly, mental reservation,) that has been devised for them, will not, in every case, save the credit of apostolical veracity. The words of Paul to the Corinthians are, *Knowing, that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord*; again, *We are willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord*. Could such expressions have been used by him, if he had held it impossible to be with the Lord, or indeed any where, without the body; and that, whatever the change was which was made by death, he could not be in the presence of the Lord, till he returned to the body? Absence from the body, and presence with the Lord, were never, therefore, more unfortunately combined, than in this illustration. Things are combined here as coincident, which, on the hypothesis of those gentlemen, are incompatible. If recourse be had to the original, the expressions in Greek are, if possible, still stronger. They are, *οἱ ἐνδημουντες ἐν τῷ σώματι*, *those who dwell in the body*, who are *ἐκδημουντες ἀπο τοῦ Κυρίου*, *at a distance from the Lord*; as, on the contrary, they are, *οἱ ἐκδημουντες ἐκ τοῦ σώματος*, *those who have travelled out of the body*, who

are *οι ενδημουντες προς τον Κυριον*, *those who reside, or are present with the Lord*. In the passage to the Philippians also, the commencement of his presence with the Lord is represented as coincident, not with his return to the body, but with his leaving it, with the dissolution, not with the restoration, of the union.

The fourth, and only other remark I shall make, on this subject, is, that from the tenor of the New Testament, the sacred writers appear to proceed on the supposition, that the soul and the body are naturally distinct and separable, and that the soul is susceptible of pain or pleasure in a state of separation. It were endless to enumerate all the places which evince this. The story of the rich man and Lazarus¹⁰⁷; the last words of our Lord upon the cross¹⁰⁸, and of Stephen when dying; Paul's doubts whether he was in the body or out of the body, when he was translated to the third heaven, and paradise¹⁰⁹; our Lord's words to Thomas, to satisfy him that he was not a spirit¹¹⁰; and to conclude, the express mention of the denial of spirits, as one of the errors of the Sadducees¹¹¹; *For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; μηδε αγγελον, μηδε πνευμα*. All these are irrefragable evidences of the general opinion, on this subject, of both Jews and Christians. By *spirit*, as distinguished from *angel*, is evidently meant the de-

¹⁰⁷ Luke, xvi. 22, 23.¹⁰⁸ Luke, xxiii. 46.¹⁰⁹ 2 Cor.

xii. 2, 3, 4.

¹¹⁰ Luke, xxiv. 39.¹¹¹ Acts, xxiii. 8.

parted spirit of a human being; for, that man is here, before his natural death, possessed of a vital and intelligent principle, which is commonly called his soul or spirit, it was never pretended that the Sadducees denied. It has been said, that this manner of expressing themselves has been adopted by the Apostles and Evangelists, merely in conformity to vulgar notions. To me it appears a conformity, which (if the sacred writers entertained the sentiments of our antagonists, on this article) is hardly reconcilable to the known simplicity and integrity of their character. It savours much more of the pious frauds, which became common afterwards, to which I own myself unwilling to ascribe so ancient and so respectable an origin. See Part I. of this Dissertation, § 10.

§ 24. I SHALL subjoin a few words on the manner wherein the distinction has been preserved between *hades* and *gehenna* by the translators of the New Testament; for, as I observed before, *gehenna*, as a name for the place of future punishment, does not occur in the Old. All the Latin translations I have seen, observe the distinction. All without exception adopt the word *gehenna*, though they do not all uniformly translate *hades*. Both the Geneva French, and Diodati, have followed the same method. Luther, on the contrary, in his German version, has uniformly confounded them, rendered both by the word *hölle*. The English translators have taken the same method, and rendering both the Greek names by the

word *hell*, except in one single place¹¹² where *ᾠδης* is translated *grave*. Most foreign versions observe the difference. So do some of the late English translators, but not all. The common method of distinguishing, hitherto observed, has been to retain the word *gehenna*, and translate *hades* either *hell* or *grave*, as appeared most to suit the context. I have chosen, in this version, to reverse that method, to render *γεεννα* always *hell*, and to retain the word *hades*. My reasons are, first, though English ears are not entirely familiarized to either term, they are much more so to the latter than to the former, in consequence of the greater use made of the latter in theological writings. Secondly, the import of the English word *hell*, when we speak as Christians, answers exactly to *γεεννα*, not to *ᾠδης*; whereas, to this last word we have no term in the language corresponding. Accordingly, though, in my judgment, it is not one of those terms which admit different meanings, there has been very little uniformity preserved by translators in rendering it.

PART III.

Μετανοεω and *Μεταμελομαι*.

I SHALL NOW offer a few remarks on two words that are uniformly rendered, by the same English word, in the common version, between which

¹¹² 1 Cor. xv. 55.

there appears, notwithstanding, to be a real difference in signification. The words are *μετανοεω* and *μεταμελομαι*, *I repent*. It has been observed by some, and, I think, with reason, that the former denotes, properly, a change to the better; the latter, barely a change, whether it be to the better or to the worse; that the former marks a change of mind that is durable and productive of consequences; the latter expresses only a present uneasy feeling of regret or sorrow for what is done, without regard either to duration or to effects; in fine, that the first may properly be translated into English, *I reform*; the second, *I repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the word.

§ 2. THE learned Grotius (whose judgment, in critical questions, is highly respectable) is not convinced that this distinction is well founded. And I acknowledge that he advances some plausible things in support of his opinion. But as I have not found them satisfactory, I shall assign my reasons for thinking differently. Let it, in the first place, be observed, that the import of *μεταμελομαι*, in the explanation given, being more extensive or generical than that of *μετανοεω*, it may, in many cases, be used, without impropriety, for *μετανοεω*; though the latter, being more limited and special in its acceptation, cannot so properly be employed for the former. The genus includes the species, not the species the genus.

§ 3. ADMITTING, therefore, that, in the expression in the parable quoted by Grotius in support of his opinion, ὑστερον δε μεταμεληθεις απηλθε, *afterwards he repented and went*¹¹³, the word μετανοησας would have been apposite, because the change spoken of is to the better, and had an effect on his conduct; still the word μεταμελομαι is not improper, no more than the English word *repented*, though the change, as far as it went, was a real reformation. Every one who reforms, repents; but every one who repents, does not reform. I use the words entirely according to the popular idiom, and not according to the definitions of theologians: nay, I say further that, in this instance, the Greek word μεταμελομαι is more proper than μετανοεω, and the English *repent* than *reform*. The reason is, because the latter expression in each language is not so well adapted to a single action, as to a habit of acting, whereas the former may be equally applied to either. Now it is only one action that is mentioned in the parable.

§ 4. IN regard to the other passage quoted by Grotius, to show that μετανοια also is used where, according to the doctrine above explained, it ought to be μεταμελεια, I think he has not been more fortunate than in the former. The passage is, where it is said of Esau¹¹⁴, *Ye know that afterwards, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected. For he found no place of repen-*

¹¹³ Matth. xxi. 29.

¹¹⁴ Heb. xii. 17.

tance, μετανοιας τοπον ουχ εβρε, *though he sought it carefully with tears.* Grotius, in his comment on the place, acknowledges that the word μετανοια is not used here literally, but by a metonymy of the effect for the cause. ‘He found no scope for effecting a change in what had been done, a revocation of the blessing given to Jacob, with a new grant of it to himself, or at least of such a blessing as might, in a great measure, supersede or cancel the former.’ This change was what he found no possibility of effecting, however earnestly and movingly he sought it. It is plain, that neither μετανοια, nor μεταμελεια, in their ordinary acceptation, expresses this change. For that it was not any repentance or reformation on himself, which he found no place for, is manifest both from the passage itself, and from the story to which it refers. From the construction of the words we learn, that what Esau did not find, was what he sought carefully with tears. Now, what he sought carefully with tears, was, as is evident from the history ¹¹⁵, such a change in his father as I have mentioned. This was what he urged so affectingly, and this was what he, notwithstanding, found it impossible to obtain. Now I acknowledge that it is only by a trope that this can be called either μετανοια or μεταμελεια. That it was not literally the regret or grief implied in μεταμελεια that he sought, is as clear as day, since the manner in which he applied to his father, showed him to be already possessed of the most pungent

¹¹⁵ Gen. xxvii. 30, &c.

grief for what had happened. Nay, it appears from the history, that the good old Patriarch, when he discovered the deceit that had been practised on him, was very strongly affected also: for it is said ¹¹⁶, that Isaac *trembled very exceedingly*. Now, as *μετανοια* implies a change of conduct, as well as sorrow for what is past, it comes nearer the scope of the sacred writer than *μεταμελεια*. If, therefore, there is some deviation from strict propriety, in the word *μετανοια* here used, it is unquestionable that, to substitute in its place *μεταμελεια*, and represent Esau as seeking, in the bitterness of grief, that he, or even his father, might be grieved, would include, not barely an impropriety, or deviation from the literal import, but an evident absurdity.

§ 5. PASSING these examples, which are all that have been produced on that side, are the words in general so promiscuously used by sacred writers, (for it is only about words which seldom occur in Scripture, that we need recur to the usage of profane authors,) as that we cannot, with certainty, or at least with probability, mark the difference? Though I do not believe this to be the case; yet, as I do not think the matter so clear as in the supposed synonymas already discussed, I shall impartially and briefly state what appears to me of weight on both sides.

¹¹⁶ Gen. xxvii. 33.

§ 6. FIRST, in regard to the usage of the Seventy, it cannot be denied that they employ the two words indiscriminately; and, if the present inquiry were about the use observed in their version, we could not, with justice, say, that they intended to mark any distinction between them. They are, besides, used indifferently in translating the same Hebrew words, so that there is every appearance that, with them, they were synonymous. But, though the use of the Seventy adds considerable strength to any argument drawn from the use of the New Testament writers, when the usages of both are the same, or even doubtful; yet, when they differ, the former, however clear, cannot, in a question which solely concerns the use that prevails in the New Testament, invalidate the evidence of the latter. We know that, in a much shorter period than that which intervened between the translation of the Old Testament, and the composition of the New, some words may become obsolete, and others may considerably alter in signification. It is, comparatively, but a short time (being less than two centuries) that has intervened between the making of our own version and the present hour; and yet, in regard to the language of that version, both have already happened, as shall be shown afterwards¹¹⁷. Several of its words are antiquated, and others bear a different meaning now from what they did then.

¹¹⁷ Diss. XI. Part II. § 5, &c.

§ 7. LET US therefore recur to the use of the New Testament. And here I observe, first, that where this change of mind is inculcated as a duty, or the necessity of it mentioned as a doctrine of Christianity, the terms are invariably *μετανοεω* and *μετανοια*. Thus John the Baptist and our Lord, both began their preaching with this injunction, *μετανοειτε* ¹¹⁸. The disciples that were sent out to warn and prepare men for the manifestation of the Messiah, are said to have gone and preached *ἵνα μετανοήσωσι* ¹¹⁹. The call which the Apostles gave to all hearers was, *μετανοήσατε, και επιστρεψατε, και βαπτισθητω ἕκαστος ἑμῶν* ¹²⁰, *reform your lives, return to God, and be baptized*. Peter's command to Simon Magus, on discovering the corruption of his heart, is, *μετανοήσον ἀπο τῆς κακίας ταύτης* ¹²¹. When it is mentioned as an order from God, *παραγγελλει τοις ἀνθρώποις πᾶσι πανταχού μετανοεῖν* ¹²². The duty to which Paul every where exhorted was, *μετανοεῖν και επιστρεφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν* ¹²³. The charge to reformation given to the Asiatic churches in the Apocalypse, is always expressed by the word *μετανοήσον*, and their failure in this particular by *οὐ μετενοήσε* ¹²⁴. The necessity of this change for preventing final ruin, is thus repeatedly expressed by our Lord, *Ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήτε, πάντες ἀπολεισθήε* ¹²⁵. And,

¹¹⁸ Matth. iii. 2. iv. 17.

¹¹⁹ Mark, vi. 2.

¹²⁰ Acts, ii. 38. iii. 19.

¹²¹ viii. 22.

¹²² xvii. 30.

¹²³ xxvi. 20.

¹²⁴ Rev. ii. and iii. *passim*.

¹²⁵ Luke, xiii. 3. 5.

in regard to the noun, wherever mention is made of this change as a duty, it is *μετανοια*, not *μεταμελεια*. It was *εις μετανοιαν* that our Lord came to call sinners ¹²⁶; the baptism which John preached was *βαπτισμα μετανοιας* ¹²⁷. The fruits of a good life, which he enjoined them to produce, were *αξιους μετανοιας* ¹²⁸. What the Apostles preached to all nations, in their Master's name, as inseparably connected, were *μετανοιαν, και αφεσιν ἁμαρτιων* ¹²⁹. Again it is given as the sum of their teaching, *την εις τον Θεον μετανοιαν, και πιστιν εις τον Κυριον ἡμων Ιησουν Χριστον* ¹³⁰. The same word is employed when the offer of such terms is exhibited as the result of divine grace ¹³¹. Now, in a question of criticism, it is hardly possible to find stronger evidence of the distinction than that which has now been produced.

§ 8. THERE is a great difference between the mention of any thing as a duty, especially of that consequence, that the promises or threats of religion depend on the performance or neglect of it; and the bare recording of an event as fact. In the former, the words ought to be as special as possible, that there may be no mistake in the application of the promise, no pretence for saying that more is exacted than was expressed in the condition. But, in relating facts, it is often a matter of indifference, whether the terms be

¹²⁶ Matth. ix. 13.

¹²⁸ Matth. iii. 8.

¹³⁰ Acts, xx. 21.

¹²⁷ Mark, i. 4.

¹²⁹ Luke, xxiv. 47.

¹³¹ Acts, xi. 18.

general or special. Provided nothing false be added, it is not expected that every thing true should be included. This is the less necessary when, in the sequel of a story, circumstances are mentioned, which supply any defect arising from the generality of the terms. Under this description may be included both the passage formerly considered, *ὑστερον μεταμεληθεις απηλθε*; and that other connected with it, in the reproach pronounced against the Pharisees, for their impenitence and incredulity under the Baptist's ministry, *ου μετεμεληθητε ὑστερον του πιστευσαι αυτω* ¹³². The last clause in each perfectly ascertains the import of the sentence, and supplies every defect.

§ 9. LET it further be observed, that when such a sorrow is alluded to, as either was not productive of reformation, or, in the nature of the thing, does not imply it, the words *μετανοια* and *μετανοεω* are never used. Thus the repentance of Judas, which drove him to despair, is expressed by *μεταμεληθεις* ¹³³. When Paul, writing to the Corinthians, mentions the sorrow his former letter had given them, he says, that, considering the good effects of that sorrow, he does not repent that he had written it, though he had formerly repented. Here no more can be understood by his own repentance spoken of, but that uneasiness which a good man feels, not from the consciousness of having done wrong, but from a tenderness

¹³² Matth. xxi. 32.

¹³³ Matth. xxvii. 3.

for others, and a fear, lest that which, prompted by duty, he had said, should have too strong an effect upon them. This might have been the case, without any fault in him, as the consequence of a reproof depends much on the temper with which it is received. His words are *Εἰ ἐλυπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ οὐ μεταμελομαι εἰ καὶ μετεμελομην*¹³⁴. As it would have made nonsense of the passage to have rendered the verb in English, *reformed* instead of *repented*, the verb *μετανοεω* instead of *μεταμελομαι*, would have been improper in Greek.

There is one passage in which this Apostle has, in effect, employed both words, and in such a manner, as clearly shows the difference. *Ἡ κατὰ Θεοῦ λύπη μετανοίαν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητον κατεργάζεται*¹³⁵: in the common version, *Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of*. There is a paronomasia here, or play upon the word *repent*, which is not in the original. As both words *μετανοεω* and *μεταμελομαι* are uniformly translated by the same English word, this figure of speech could hardly have been avoided in the common version. Now, had the two words been also synonymous in Greek (as that trope, when it comes in the way, is often adopted by the sacred writers,) it had been more natural to say *μετανοίαν ἀμετανοήτον*. Whereas the change of the word plainly shows that, in the Apostle's judgment, there would have been something incongruous in that expression. In the first word

¹³⁴ 2 Cor. vii. 8.¹³⁵ Verse 10.

μετανοϊαν, is expressed the effect of godly sorrow, which is reformation, a duty required by our religion as necessary to salvation. In the other αμεταμελητον, there is no allusion to a further reformation, but to a further change, it being only meant to say, that the reformation effected is such as shall never be regretted, never repented of. As into the import of this word there enters no consideration of goodness or badness, but barely of change, from whatever motive or cause; the word αμεταμελητος comes to signify *steady, immutable, irrevocable*. This is evidently the meaning of it in that expression, *Αμεταμελητα τα χαρισματα και η κλησις του Θεου*¹³⁶, which our translators render, *the gifts and calling of God are without repentance*; more appositely and perspicuously, are *irrevocable*. For this reason the word μεταμελομαι is used when the sentence relates to the constancy or immutability of God. Thus Ωμοσε Κυριος και ου μεταμεληθησεται¹³⁷: *The Lord hath sworn and will not repent*, that is, *alter his purpose*.

The word αμετανοητον, on the contrary, including somewhat of the sense of its primitive, expresses not, as the other, *unchanged or unchangeable*, but *unreformed, unreformable, impenitent*. The Apostle says, addressing himself to the obstinate infidel, *κατα την σκληροτητα σου και αμετανοητον καρδιαν*¹³⁸. *After thy hardness and impenitent, or irreclaimable heart*. The word αμετανοητος, in the New Testament style, ought

¹³⁶ Rom. xi. 29.¹³⁷ Heb. vii. 21.¹³⁸ Rom. ii. 5.

analogically to express a wretched state, as it signifies the want of that *μετανοια*, which the Gospel every where represents as the indispensable duty of the lapsed, and therefore as essential to their becoming Christians : but the term *αμεταμελητον* is no-way fitted to this end, as it expresses only the absence of that *μεταμελεια*, which is no-where represented as a virtue, or required as a duty, and which may be good, bad, or indifferent, according to its object. Thus I have shown, that on every pertinent occasion, the distinction is sacredly observed by the penmen of the New Testament, and that the very few instances in which it may appear otherwise at first glance, are found to be no exceptions when attentively examined.

§ 10. HAVING now ascertained the distinction, it may be asked, How the words ought to be discriminated in a translation ? In my opinion, *μετανοεω*, in most cases, particularly where it is expressed as a command, or mentioned as a duty, should be rendered by the English verb *reform*, *μετανοια*, by *reformation* ; and that *μεταμελομαι* ought to be translated *repent*. *Μεταμελεια* is defined by Phavorinus *δυσαρεστησις επι πεπραγμενοις*, *dissatisfaction with one's self, for what one has done*, which exactly hits the meaning of the word *repentance* ; whereas *μετανοια* is defined *γνησια απο πταισματος επι το εναντιον αγαθον επιστροφη*, and *η προς το κρειττον επιστροφη*, *a genuine correction of faults, and a change from worse to better*. We cannot more exactly

define the word *reformation*. It may be said that, in using the terms *repent* and *repentance*, as our translators have done, for both the original terms, there is no risk of any dangerous error ; because, in the theological definitions of repentance, given by almost all parties, such a reformation of the disposition is included, as will infallibly produce a reformation of conduct. This, however, does not satisfy. Our Lord and his Apostles accommodated themselves in their style to the people whom they addressed, by employing words according to the received and vulgar idiom, and not according to the technical use of any learned doctors. It was not to such that this doctrine was revealed, but to those who, in respect of acquired knowledge, were babes¹³⁹. The learned use is known, comparatively, but to a few : and it is certain that with us, according to the common acceptance of the words, a man may be said just as properly to repent of a good, as of a bad, action. A covetous man will repent of the alms which a sudden fit of pity may have induced him to bestow. Besides, it is but too evident, that a man may often justly be said to repent, who never reforms. In neither of these ways do I find the word *μετανοεω* ever used.

I have another objection to the word *repent*. It unavoidably appears to lay the principal stress on the sorrow or remorse which it implies for former misconduct. Now this appears a secondary

¹³⁹ Matth. xi. 25.

matter, at the most, and not to be the idea suggested by the Greek verb. The primary object is a real change of conduct. The Apostle expressly distinguishes it from sorrow, in a passage lately quoted, representing it as what the sorrow, if of a godly sort, terminates in, or produces. Ἡ κατα Θεον λυπη μετανοιαν κατεργαζεται, rendered in the common version, *Godly sorrow worketh repentance*. Now, if he did not mean to say that the thing was caused by itself, or that repentance worketh repentance (and who will charge him with this absurdity?) ἡ κατα Θεον λυπη is one thing, and μετανοια is another. But it is certain that our word repentance implies no more in common use, even in its best sense, than ἡ κατα Θεον λυπη, and often not so much. It is consequently not a just interpretation of the Greek word μετανοια, which is not ἡ κατα Θεον λυπη, but its certain consequence. Grief or remorse, compared with this, is but an accidental circumstance. Who had more grief than Judas, whom it drove to despondency and self-destruction? To him the Evangelist applies very properly the term μεταμεληθεις, which we as properly translate *repented*. He was in the highest degree dissatisfied with himself. But, to show that a great deal more is necessary in the Christian, neither our Lord himself, as we have seen, nor his forerunner John, nor his Apostles and ministers who followed, ever expressed themselves in this manner, when recommending to their hearers the great duties of Christianity. They never called out to the people, μεταμελεσθε, but always μετανοειτε. If they

were so attentive to this distinction, in order to prevent men, in so important an article, from placing their duty in a barren remorse, however violent; we ought not surely to express this capital precept of our religion, by a term that is just as well adapted to the case of Judas, as to that of Peter. For the Greek word *μεταμελομαι*, though carefully avoided by the inspired writers, in expressing our duty, is fully equivalent to the English word *repent*.

§ 11. I SHALL now, ere I conclude this subject, consider briefly in what manner some of the principal translators have rendered the words in question into other languages. I shall begin with the Syriac, being the most respectable, on the score of antiquity, of all we are acquainted with. In this venerable version, which has served as a model to interpreters in the East, in like manner as the Vulgate has served to those in the West, the distinction is uniformly preserved. *Μετανοειν* is rendered תוב *thub*, to reform, to return to God, to amend one's life; *μετανοια* תבותא *thebutha*, reformation; *μεταμελεσθαι* is rendered תוא *thua*, to repent, to be sorry for what one has done. Nor are these Syriac words ever confounded as synonymous, except in the Apocalypse, which, though now added in the printed editions, is no part of that ancient translation, but was made many centuries after.

The second place in point of antiquity is, no doubt, due to the Vulgate, where, I acknowledge, there is no distinction made. The usual term

for μετανοια is *pœnitentia*, for μετανοεω and μεταμελομαι, indiscriminately, *pœnitentiam ago*, *pœnitentiam habeo*, *pœniteo*, or *me pœnitet*. These can hardly be said to express more than the English words *repentance* and *repent*. Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον is not improperly rendered *pœnitentiam stabilem*, agreeably to an acceptation of the term above taken notice of.

Beza, one of the most noted, and by Protestants most imitated, of all the Latin translators since the reformation, has carefully observed the distinction, wherever it was of consequence; for, as I remarked, there are a few cases in which either term might have been used in the original, and concerning which, a translator must be directed by the idiom of the tongue in which he writes. The same distinction had been made before, though not with perfect uniformity, by the translators of Zurich. Beza's word for μετανοεω is *resipisco*, and for μετανοια, *resipiscentia*. To this last term he was led both by analogy, and (if not by classical authority) by the authority of early ecclesiastical writers, which, in the translation of holy writ, is authority sufficient. These words have this advantage of *pœnitere* and *pœnitentia*, that they always denote a change of some continuance, and a change to the better. For μεταμελομαι his word is *pœnitere*. Thus μεταμεληθεις, spoken of Judas, is *pœnitens*: Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον, *resipiscentiam cujus nunquam pœniteat*, in which the force of both words is very well expressed. So is also αμετανοητον καρδιαν, *cor quod resipiscere nescit*. Erasmus, one of the

earliest translators on the Romish side, uses both *resipisco* and *pœnitentiam ago*, but with no discrimination. They are not only both employed in rendering the same word *μετανοεω*, but even when the scope is the same. Thus *μετανοειτε*, in the imperative, is at one time *resipiscite*, at another *pœnitentiam agite*: so that his only view seems to have been to diversify his style.

Castalio, one of the most eminent Latin Protestant translators, has been sensible of the distinction, and careful to preserve it in his version. But, as his great aim was to give a classical air to the books of Scripture, in order to engage readers of taste who affected an elegant and copious diction; he has disfigured, with his adventitious ornaments, the native simplicity which so remarkably distinguishes the sacred penmen, and is, in fact, one of their greatest ornaments. We can more easily bear rusticity than affectation, especially on the most serious and important subjects. Among other arts, by which Castalio has endeavoured to recommend his work, one is a studied variety in the phrases, that the ear may not be tired by too frequent recurrence to the same sounds. The words under consideration afford a strong example. The verb *μετανοεω* is translated by him, I know not how many different ways. It is *se corrigere, vitam corrigere, redire ad frugem, redire ad sanitatem, reverti ad sanitatem*; when the vices which we are required to amend are mentioned, the phrase is, *desciscere a sua pravitate, desistere a turpitudine, desistere a suis operibus, impudicitia sua recedere, sua homicidia, &c. omit-*

tere. Μετανοια partakes of the like variety. It is *emendata vita, vitæ emendatio, correctæ vita, vitæ correctio, morum correctio, correcti mores, corrigenda vita, sanitas, pœnitentia*; and in the oblique cases, *frugem* and *bonam frugem*. For μεταμελομαι I only find the two words *pœnitere* and *mutare sententiam*. Μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον is not badly rendered *vitæ correctionem nunquam pœnitendam, αμεταμελητα χαριδματα munera irrevocabilia, and αμετανοητος καρδια, deploratus animus*.

Diodati, the Italian translator, in every case of moment, renders the verb μετανοειν *ravedersi*, which in the Vocabolario della Crusca is explained *resipiscere, ad mentis sântitatem redire*; but for the noun μετανοια he always uses *penitenza*, and for μεταμελομαι, very properly *pentirsi*. The Geneva French translates μετανοεω, *s'amender*, μεταμελομαι, *se repentir*, and μετανοια *repentance*. In both these versions they use, in rendering μετανοιαν αμεταμελητον, the same paronomasia which is in the common English version. Diodati has *penitenza della quale huom non si pente*. The Geneva French has *repentance dont on ne se repent*. The other passages, also above quoted from the original, they translate in nearly the same manner. Luther, in his German translation, has generally distinguished the two verbs, rendering μετανοειν *büſſe thun*, and μεταμελεσθαι, *reuen* or *ge-reuen*.

464
 32

PART IV.

ἅγιος AND *ὁσῖος*.

I SHALL give, as another example of words, supposed to be synonymous, the terms *ἅγιος* and *ὁσῖος*. The former is, if I mistake not, uniformly rendered in the New Testament, *holy*, or, when used substantively in the plural, *saints*. The latter, except in one instance, is always rendered by the same term, not only in the English Bible, but in most modern translations. Yet that these two Greek words are altogether equivalent, there is, in my opinion, good reason to doubt. Both belong to the second class of words which I explained in a former Dissertation¹⁴⁰. They relate to manners, and are therefore not so easily defined. Nor are such words in one language ever found exactly to tally with those of another. There are, however, certain means, by which the true signification may, in most cases, be, very nearly, if not entirely, reached. I shall, therefore, first mention my reasons for thinking that the two words *ἅγιος* and *ὁσῖος*, in the New Testament, are not synonymous, and then endeavour to ascertain the precise meaning of each.

¹⁴⁰ Diss. II. § 4.

§ 2. THAT there is a real difference in signification between the two Greek words, notwithstanding their affinity, my first reason for thinking is, because in the Septuagint, which is the foundation of the Hellenistic idiom, one of them is that by which one Hebrew word, and the other that by which another, not at all synonymous, is commonly translated. *ἅγιος* is the word used for קדוש *kadosh*, *sanctus*, *holy*, ὁσιος for חסיד *chasid*, *benignus*, *gracious*.

§ 3. MY second reason is, because these words have been understood by the ancient Greek translators to be so distinct in signification, that not, in one single instance, is the Hebrew word *kadosh* rendered by the Greek ὁσιος or *chasid* by ἅγιος. What gives additional weight to this reason, is the consideration, that both words frequently occur; and that the Greek translators, though they have not been uniform in rendering either, but have adopted different words, on different occasions, for translating each; have, nevertheless, not in a single instance, adopted any of those terms for rendering one of these Hebrew words, which they had adopted for rendering the other. Few words occur oftener than *kadosh*. But, though it is, beyond comparison, oftenest translated ἅγιος, it is not so always. In one place it is rendered καθάρος, *mundus*, *clean*; the verb *kadash*, the etymon, is rendered δοξάζειν, *glorificare*, *to glorify*, ἀναβιβάζειν *ascendere facere*, *to cause to ascend*, καθαρίζειν *purgare*, *to cleanse*, ἀγνίζειν *purificare*, *to purify*, as well as ἁγιαζειν and

καθαγιαζειν *sanctificare, to hallow, to sanctify*; but not once by ὁσιος, or any of its conjugates. On the other hand, *chasid* is rendered ελεημων and πολυελεος *misericors, merciful, ευλαβης pious, devout*, and by some other words, but not once by ἅγιος, or by any of its conjugates, or by any of the terms employed in rendering *kadosh*; a certain sign that, to the old Greek translators, several other words appeared to have more coincidence with either than these had with each other.

§ 4. THE third reason, which inclines me to think that the two words are not synonymous, is, because I find, on examining and comparing, that there is a considerable difference in the application of them, not only in the Old Testament, but in the New. In regard to the word ἅγιος, it is applied not only to persons, but to things inanimate, as the sacred utensils and vestments; to times, as their jubilees and sabbaths, their solemn festivals and fasts; and to places, as the land of Judea, the city of Jerusalem, the mountain whereon stood the temple with its courts; but more especially the house which the courts inclosed, the outer part whereof was called, by way of eminence, ἡ ἅγια scilicet σκηνη, *the holy place*, and the inner ἡ ἅγια ἁγίων, *the holy of holies, or the most holy place*. Now I find nothing like this in the use made of the word ὁσιος, which as far as I can discover, is applied only to persons, or beings susceptible of character. The τα ὁσια Δαβιδ¹⁴¹,

¹⁴¹ Isaiah. lv. 3. Acts, xiii. 34.

cannot be accounted an exception. The word used by the Prophet is חֶסֶד *chesed*, *benignitas*, not חַסִּיד *chasid*, *benignus*, and is not improperly rendered in our version *mercies*. Nor is the ἁγίους *χειρας* of the Apostle ¹⁴², an exception, this being manifestly not a literal, but a tropical use of the epithet, wherein that is applied to the instrument, which, in strictness, is applicable only to the agent; as when we say a *slandering tongue* and *guilty hands*, we are always understood as applying the qualities of *slander* and *guilt*, to the person of whose tongue and hands we are speaking.

§ 5. I OBSERVE, further, that even when ἅγιος is applied to persons, it has not always a relation to the moral character, but often to something which, in regard to the person, is merely circumstantial and external. It is, in this respect, that the children of Israel are called a *holy* nation, being consecrated by their circumcision, notwithstanding they were a rebellious and stiff-necked people, and rather worse, instead of better, than other nations; as their great legislator Moses often declares to them. In this sense the tribe of Levi was *holier* than any other tribe, purely because selected for the sacred service; the priesthood had more *holiness* than the other Levites, and the high-priest was the *holiest* of all. There was the same gradation in these, as in the courts and house of the temple. It is in this sense I understand the word ἅγιος, as applied to Aaron;

¹⁴² 1 Tim. ii. 3.

*They envied Moses, also, in the camp, and Aaron the saint of the Lord*¹⁴³; *τον ἅγιον Κυρίου*. Aaron's personal character does not seem to have entitled him to this distinction above Moses, and the whole nation. Nor does the title seem to have been peculiarly applicable to him, in any other sense than that now mentioned, namely, that he was the only one of the people who carried on his forehead the signature of his consecration, *holiness to the Lord, ἁγιασμα Κυρίου*.

§ 6. ON the other hand, it does not appear, from any clear passage, either in the Old Testament or in the New, that the Hebrew word *chasid*, or the Greek *hosios*, are susceptible of this interpretation. I say, any clear passage; for I acknowledge there is one, the only one I can find in either, wherein the application of this term, as commonly understood, is similar to that of the other lately quoted from the Psalms. It is in Moses' benediction of the tribes, immediately before his death: *Of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah*¹⁴⁴. Not to mention, that in the Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch (which in some things is more correct than the Hebrew,) there is a different reading of the word here rendered ὅσιος; the whole passage is exceedingly obscure; insomuch that it is impossible to say, with certainty, who is

¹⁴³ Psal. cvi. 16.¹⁴⁴ Deut. xxxiii. 8.

here called *chasidecha*, which our translators have rendered *thy holy one*. The words which follow serve rather to increase the darkness, than to remove it.

Houbigant, in his valuable edition of the Old Testament, with a new Latin translation, and notes, will not admit that it can refer to Aaron, or his successors in the pontificate; and, in my judgment, supports his opinion with unanswerable reasons. One is that, the term *chamid, hosios*, is never applied to Aaron, nor to the priesthood in general, nor to any priest as such. Another is that, though we often hear of the people's proving God at Massah, and contending with him at the waters of Meribah, we nowhere hear that they proved or tempted Aaron, and strove with him, there. Indeed, if they had been said to have tempted Moses, the expression, though unusual, had been less improper, because the immediate recourse of the people, in their strait, was to Moses. They chid with him, we are told, and were almost ready to stone him¹⁴⁵. Houbigant's opinion is, that by *thy holy one*, is here meant Jesus Christ, who is distinguished by this appellation in the Book of Psalms. *Thou wilt not suffer thy holy one, חסידך chasidecha, τον ὁσιον σου, to see corruption*¹⁴⁶. And to say that they strove with, tempted or proved Christ in the wilderness, is conformable to the language of Scripture. *Neither let us tempt Christ, says Paul*¹⁴⁷, *as some*

¹⁴⁵ Exod. xvii. 1, &c. Numb. xx. 3, &c.

¹⁴⁶ Psal. xvi. 10.

¹⁴⁷ 1 Cor. x. 9.

of them also tempted, referring to what happened in the desert, and were destroyed of serpents. Houbigant's version (the words being understood as addressed to Levi, according to the original,) is *Levi autem dixit, Thummim tuum, tuumque Urim viri sancti tui est, quem tu tentationis in loco tentasti, cui convitium fecisti, apud aquas contradictionis.* It must be owned, that he has added some plausibility to his gloss upon the passage, by the turn he has given to the following verses. But it is sufficient for my purpose to say, in regard to the negative part of his remark, that he is certainly right in maintaining that the expression does not refer to Aaron and his successors. But as to the positive part, that it refers to our Lord Jesus Christ, will perhaps be thought more questionable. His being styled *thy holy one, τὸν ὅσιον σου,* in words addressed to God, is not authority enough for understanding him to be meant by *τὸ ὅσιόν σου, to thy holy one,* in words addressed to Levi.

§ 7. BUT to return : another difference in the application of the words *ἅγιος* and *ὅσιος*, is that the latter is sometimes found coupled with other epithets expressive of different good qualities, and applied to character or moral conduct, each exhibiting, as it were, a feature distinct from those exhibited by the rest. The word *ἅγιος* is not commonly accompanied with other epithets : when it is, they are of such a general nature, as rather to affect the whole character than separate parts

of it. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says of our Lord¹⁴⁸, that he was ὁσῖος, ἀκακος, ἀμικαντος, in the common translation, *holy, harmless, undefiled*. But the English word *holy*, being general in its signification, adds nothing to the import of the other epithets, especially of ἀμικαντος, and consequently does not hit the exact meaning of the word ὁσῖος, which here probably denotes *pious*; the two other epithets, being employed to express compendiously the regards due to others, and to himself. Paul has given us another example in his character of a bishop, who, he says¹⁴⁹, ought to be φιλοξενον, φιλαγαθον, σωφρονα, δικαιον, ὁσιον, εγκρατη. To render the word ὁσιος, in this verse *holy*, is chargeable with the same fault as in the former instance. The same thing holds also of the adverb ὁσιως. Now the word ἅγιος is not included in this manner, in an enumeration of good qualities. It is commonly found single, or joined with other epithets equally general. The expression used by the Apostle¹⁵⁰, ὁ μὲν νομος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἅγια, καὶ δικαία, καὶ ἀγαθὴ: *The law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good*—is no exception; for we have no enumeration here of the virtues of an individual, but of the general good qualities that may be ascribed to God's law. And though the terms are equally general, they are not synonymous; they present us with the different aspects of the same object. To say that the law of God is *holy*, is to represent it as awful

¹⁴⁸ Heb. vii. 26.¹⁴⁹ Tit. i. 8.¹⁵⁰ Rom. vii. 12.

to creatures such as we ; to say it is *just*, is to remind us that it is obligatory ; and to say it is *good*, is to tell us, in other words, that it is adapted to promote universal happiness, and therefore *lovely*.

§ 8. HAVING assigned my reasons for thinking that the two words *δσιος* and *άγιος* in the New Testament are not synonymous, I shall now, as I proposed, endeavour to ascertain the precise meaning of each. I believe it will appear, on examination, that the affinity between the two Greek words, in their ordinary and classical acceptation, is greater than between the Hebrew words, in lieu of which they have been so generally substituted by the Seventy. This, which may have originated from some peculiarity in the idiom of Alexandria, has, I suppose, led the translators of both Testaments to regard them often as equivalent, and to translate them by the same word. The authors of the Vulgate in particular, have almost always employed *sanctus* in expounding both. This has misled most modern interpreters in the West. As to our own translators, the example has, doubtless, had some influence. Nevertheless they have, in this, not so implicitly followed the Vulgate, in their version of the Old Testament, as in that of the New. Let it be premised, that the significations of words, in any nation, do not remain invariably the same. In a course of years much fewer than two thousand, which are reckoned to have elapsed from the commencement to the finishing of the sacred canon, very

considerable changes happen in the meanings of words in the same language, and among the same people. Now, to trace the gradations and nicer shades of meaning, which distinguish different periods, is one of the most difficult, but most important, tasks of criticism.

§ 9. IN regard to the word *kadosh*, *hagios*, I acknowledge that it does not seem to me to have had originally any relation to character or morals. Its primitive signification appears to have been *clean*; first, in the literal sense, as denoting free from all filth, dirt, or nastiness; secondly, as expressing what, according to the religious ritual, was accounted *clean*. The first is natural, the second ceremonial, cleanness. Some traces of the first of these meanings we have in the Old Testament, but nothing is more common there than the second, particularly in the Pentateuch. Again, as things are made clean to prepare them for being used (and the more important the use, the more carefully they are cleaned,) the term has been adopted to denote, thirdly, *prepared, fitted, destined for* a particular purpose, of what kind soever the purpose be; fourthly, and more especially, *consecrated*, or devoted to a religious use; fifthly, as things, so prepared and devoted, are treated with peculiar care and attention, *to hallow* or *sanctify*, comes to signify to honour, to reverence, to stand in awe of, and *holy*, to imply worthy of this treatment, that is, honourable, *venerable*, awful: sixthly, and lastly, as outward and

corporeal cleanness has, in all ages and languages been considered as an apt metaphor for moral purity, it denotes guiltless, *irreproachable*, which is at present, among Christians, the most common acceptance of the word.

§ 10. I SHALL give an example or two of each of the six uses aforesaid, not confining myself to the adjective *kadosh*, but including its conjugates of the same root. First, that it denotes *clean* in the vulgar acceptance, is manifest from the precept given to Israel in the desert, to be careful to keep the camp free from all odour¹⁵¹. The reason assigned is 'in these words: *For the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, therefore shall thy camp be holy*, וְהָיָה קְרוֹשׁ וְיָהוָה יֵשֵׁב בְּמִטְתּוֹ וְיֵשֵׁב בְּמִטְתּוֹ וְיֵשֵׁב בְּמִטְתּוֹ וְיֵשֵׁב בְּמִטְתּוֹ, *and εἶπαι ἅγια, that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee.*

Another remarkable example of this meaning we have in the history of king Hezekiah, who is said to have given orders to the Levites¹⁵², to sanctify the house of the Lord; the import of which order is explained by the words immediately following, and *carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place*. The sacred service had, in the reign of the impious Ahaz, been for a long time totally neglected; the lamps were gone out, and the fire extinguished on the altars, both of burnt-offerings and of incense; nay, and the temple itself had at length been absolutely deserted and

¹⁵¹ See the whole passage, Deut. xxiii. 12, 13, 14.

¹⁵² 2 Chron. xxix. 5, &c.

shut up. The king, intending to restore the religious worship of Jehovah to its former splendour, saw that the first thing necessary was to make clean the house, with all its furniture, that they might be fit for the service. Frequent mention is made of this cleansing in the chapter above referred to, where it is sometimes called *cleansing*¹⁵³, sometimes *sanctifying*¹⁵⁴; the Hebrew verbs טהר *tahar*, and כִּדָּשׁ *kadash*, being manifestly, through the whole chapter, used indiscriminately. Both words are, accordingly, in this passage, rendered by the Seventy indifferently ἀγνίζειν and καθαρίζειν, not ἀγιάζειν; in the Vulgate *mundare*, *expiare*, and once *sanctificare*. In both the above examples the word *holy* is evidently the opposite of *dirty, nasty, filthy*, in the current acceptance of the terms. This, as being the simplest and most obvious, is probably the primitive sense. Things sensible first had names in every language. The names were afterwards extended to things conceivable and intellectual. This is according to the natural progress of knowledge.

§ 11. FROM this first signification, the transition is easy to that which, in the eye of the ceremonial law, is clean. One great purpose of that law, though neither the only, nor the chief, purpose, is to draw respect to the religious service, by guarding against every thing that might savour of

¹⁵³ Verse 15, 16. 18.

¹⁵⁴ Verse 5. 17. 19.

indecenty or uncleanness. The climate, as well as the nature of their service, rendered this more necessary than we are apt to imagine. Any thing which could serve as a security against infectious disorders in their public assemblies, whereof, as they lived in a hot climate, they were in much greater danger than we are, was a matter of the highest importance. Now, when once a fence is established by statute, it is necessary, in order to support its authority, that the letter of the statute should be the rule in all cases. Hence it will happen, that there may be a defilement in the eye of the law, where there is no natural foulness at all. This I call *ceremonial uncleanness*, to express the reverse of which, the term *holy* is frequently employed. Thus, by avoiding to eat what was accounted unclean food, they sanctified themselves¹⁵⁵; they were likewise kept holy by avoiding the touch of dead bodies, to avoid which, was particularly required of the priests, except in certain cases, they being obliged, by their ministry, to be holier than others¹⁵⁶. Moses is said¹⁵⁷ to sanctify the people by making them wash their clothes, and go through the legal ceremonies of purification. Nor is it possible to doubt that, when men were ordered to sanctify themselves directly, for a particular occasion, they were enjoined the immediate performance of something which could be visibly and quickly executed, and not the acquisition of a character, which is

¹⁵⁵ Lev. xi. 42, &c. xx. 25, 26.

¹⁵⁶ Lev. xxi. 1—6.

¹⁵⁷ Exod. xix. 10. 14. 22.

certainly not the work of an hour or of a day. Thus the priests were to sanctify themselves, before they approached the Lord on Sinai; and thus the people were commanded by Joshua to sanctify themselves, in the evening, that they might be prepared for seeing the wonders which God was to perform among them, next day¹⁵⁸. In the same sense, Joshua also is said to sanctify the people¹⁵⁹. In this sense, we are also to understand what we are told of those who sanctified themselves, for the observance of that great pass-over which Hezekiah caused to be celebrated. What is termed *sanctifying* in one verse, is *cleansing* in another¹⁶⁰. To prevent being tedious, I do not repeat the whole passages, but refer to them in the margin; the reader may consult them at his leisure.

Even in the New Testament, where the word is not so frequently used in the ceremonial sense, *holy* and *unclean*, *ἅγιος* and *ακαθάρτος*, are contrasted as natural opposites¹⁶¹. In one place in the Old Testament¹⁶², the Seventy have rendered the word *kadosh καθάρτος*, as entirely equivalent, calling that pure or *clean* water, which, in Hebrew, is *holy water*; and oftener than once in the Targums or Chaldee paraphrases, the Hebrew *kadosh* is rendered, by their common term, for *clean*. Thus, in that passage of the Prophet¹⁶³, “Stand by thyself; come not near me, for I am

¹⁵⁸ Josh. iii. 5. ¹⁵⁹ Josh. vii. 13.

¹⁶⁰ 2 Chron. xxx. 17, 18.

¹⁶¹ 1 Cor. vii. 14. ¹⁶² Numb. v. 17.

¹⁶³ Isaiah, lxxv. 5

“*holier* than thou,” the last clause is in Chaldee, “I am *cleaner* than thou.”

§ 12. IN regard to the third sense, separated or *prepared* for a special purpose, there are several examples. The appointing of places for cities of refuge is, both in the original, and in the Septuagint¹⁶⁴, called sanctifying them. To make ready for war is, in several places, to *sanctify* war¹⁶⁵. In such places, however, the Seventy have not imitated the Hebrew penmen, probably thinking it too great a stretch for the Greek language to employ *αγιαζω* in this manner. In one place, men are said to be *sanctified* for destruction¹⁶⁶, that is, devoted or prepared for it. To devote to a bad, even to an idolatrous use, is called *to sanctify*. Thus, both in Hebrew, and in Greek, Micah’s mother is said¹⁶⁷, to *sanctify* the silver which she had devoted for making an idol, for her and her family to worship. From this application, probably, has sprung such anomalous productions as קרשה *kedeshah*, a prostitute, and קרשים *kedeshim*, Sodomites. Nor is this so strange as it may at first appear. Similar examples may be found in most tongues. The Latin *sacer*, which commonly signifies *sacred*, *holy*, *venerable*, sometimes denotes the contrary, and is equivalent to *scelestus*. *Auri sacra fames*, the execrable thirst of gold.

¹⁶⁴ Josh. xx. 7.

¹⁶⁶ Jer. xii. 3.

¹⁶⁵ Jer. vi. 4. Mic. iii. 5.

¹⁶⁷ Judg. xvii. 3.

§ 13. THE fourth meaning mentioned, was devoted to religious or pious use. Thus Jeremiah was *sanctified*¹⁶⁸, from the womb, in being ordained a Prophet unto the nations; the priests and the Levites were sanctified or consecrated for their respective sacred offices. It were losing time to produce examples of an use so frequently to be met with in Scripture, and almost in every page of the Books of Moses. In this sense, (for it admits degrees) the Jewish nation was called *holy*, they being consecrated to God by circumcision, the seal of his covenant; in this sense also, all who profess Christianity are denominated *saints*, having been dedicated to God in their baptism.

§ 14. OF the fifth meaning, according to which, to *hallow* or *sanctify* denotes to respect, to honour, to venerate; and *holy* denotes respectable, honourable, venerable; we have many examples. Thus to *hallow* God is opposed to profaning his name¹⁶⁹, that is, to treating him with irreverence and disrespect. It is opposed also to the display of a want of confidence in his power, and in his promise¹⁷⁰. It is in this meaning the word is used, when we are required to sanctify the Sabbath, that is, to treat it with respect; and are commanded to pray that God's name may be hallowed, that is, honoured, revered. It is in this meaning chiefly that the word seems, in a lower degree,

¹⁶⁸ Jer. i. 5.

¹⁶⁹ Lev. xxii. 32.

¹⁷⁰ Numb. xx. 12.

applied to angels, and, in the highest, to the Lord of heaven and earth.

There are some things which incline me to conclude, that this is more properly the import of the word, at least in the application to God, than, as is commonly supposed, moral excellence in general. Doubtless, both the moral, and what are called the natural, attributes of God, may be considered as, in some respect, included, being the foundations of that profound reverence with which he ought ever to be mentioned, and more especially addressed by mortals. But it is worthy of our notice, that when the term *holy* is applied to God, and accompanied with other attributives, they are such as infuse fear rather than love, and suggest ideas of vengeance rather than of grace: When Joshua found it necessary to alarm the fears of an inconsiderate nation, he told them, *Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is a holy God, he is a jealous God ; he will not forgive your transgressions and sins*¹⁷¹. Again, this epithet *holy* is more frequently than any other applied to God's name. Now, if we consider what other epithets are thus applied in Scripture, we shall find that they are not those which express any natural or moral qualities abstractedly considered ; they are not the names of essential attributes, but such only as suggest the sentiments of awe and reverence with which he ought to be regarded by every reasonable creature. No mention is made of

¹⁷¹ Joshua, xxiv. 19.

God's wise name, powerful name, or true name, good name, or merciful name, faithful name, or righteous name; yet all these qualities, wisdom, power, truth, goodness, mercy, faithfulness, and righteousness, are, in numberless instances, ascribed to God, as the eternal and immutable perfections of his nature: but there is mention of his fearful name, his glorious name, his great name, his reverend name, and his excellent name, sometimes even of his dreadful name, but oftenest of his holy name; for all these terms are comparative, and bear an immediate reference to the sentiments of the humble worshipper. Nay, as the epithet *holy* is often found in conjunction with some of the others above mentioned, which admit this application, they serve to explain it. Thus the Psalmist¹⁷², *Let them praise thy great and terrible name, for it is holy.* Again¹⁷³, *Holy and reverend is his name.*

What was the display which Jehovah made to the Philistines, when his ark was in their possession, a display which extorted from them the acknowledgment that the God of Israel is a holy God, before whom they could not stand? It was solely of sovereignty and uncontroullable power in the destruction of their idol god Dagon, and great numbers of the people. This filled them with such terror at the bare sight of the ark, the symbol of God's presence, as was too much for them to bear. And indeed both the Greek

¹⁷² Psal. xcix. 3.

¹⁷³ Psal. cxi. 9.

ἅγιος, and the Latin *sanctus*, admit the same meaning, and are often equivalent to *augustus*, *venerandus*. The former term *augustus*, Castalio has frequently, and not improperly, adopted in his version, when the Hebrew word *kadosh* is applied to God. The change of the epithet *sanctus* is not necessary; but if perspicuity be thought in a particular case to require it, I should prefer the latter term *venerandus*, as more expressive of religious awe. Further, when the term *holy* is ascribed by angels to God, we find it accompanied with such words or gestures as are expressive of the profoundest awe and veneration.

The description, action, and exclamation of the seraphim in Isaiah ¹⁷⁴, lead our thoughts more to the ideas of majesty and transcendent glory than to those of a moral nature. *I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lofty, and his train filled the temple: above it stood the seraphim: each one had six wings: with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried to another and said, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah the God of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory. And the pillars of the porch were shaken by the voice of him that cried; and the house was filled with smoke.* Every thing in this description is awful and majestic. That he is the Lord of hosts who dwelleth on high, in whose august presence even the seraphim must veil their faces, and that the whole earth is

¹⁷⁴ Isaiah, vi. 1, &c.

full of his glory, are introduced as the ground of ascribing to him thrice, in the most solemn manner, the epithet *holy*.

There is a passage pretty similar to this in the Apocalypse¹⁷⁵. *The four beasts* (or, as the word ought to be rendered, *living creatures*;) *had each of them six wings about him, and they were full of eyes within ; and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty, who was, and is, and is to come. And when those creatures give glory, and honour, and thanks, to him that sitteth on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever ; the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power ; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and they were created.* Here every circumstance points to the majesty, power, and dominion, not to the moral perfections of God ; the action and doxology of the elders make the best comment on the exclamation of the four living creatures, *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, &c.*

It is universally admitted, that to hallow or sanctify the name of God, is to venerate, to *honour* it. According to analogy, therefore, to affirm that the name of God is holy, is to affirm that it is *honourable*, that it is *venerable*. Nay, in the same sense, we are said to sanctify

¹⁷⁵ Rev. iv. 8, &c.

God himself; that is, to make him the object of our veneration and awe. In this way, to sanctify God, is nearly the same as to fear him, differing chiefly in degree, and may be opposed to an undue fear of man. Thus it is employed by the Prophet¹⁷⁶, *Say not, A confederacy to all them to whom this people shall say, a confederacy, neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.* But nothing can give a more apposite example of this use than the words of Moses to Aaron¹⁷⁷, on occasion of the terrible fate of Aaron's two sons, Nadab and Abihu. *This is that the Lord spake, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me; and before all the people I will be glorified.* Their transgression was, that they offered before the Lord strange fire, or what was, not the peculiar fire of the altar, lighted originally from heaven, but ordinary fire kindled from their own hearth, an action which, in the eye of that dispensation, must be deemed the grossest indignity. Spencer¹⁷⁸ has well expressed the sense of the passage in these words: "Deum sanctum esse, id est, a quavis persona vel eminentia, incomparabili naturæ suæ excellentia, separatum, ideoque postulare, ut sanctificetur, id est, auguste, decore, et ritu naturæ suæ separatæ, imaginem quandam ferente, colatur."

¹⁷⁶ Isaiah, viii. 12, 13.

¹⁷⁷ Lev. x. 1, &c.

¹⁷⁸ Lib. I. cap. vii.

§ 15. THE sixth and last sense mentioned, was *moral purity* and innocence, a sense which, by a very natural turn of thinking, arises out of the two first meanings assigned, namely, clean in the common import of the word, and clean in the eye of the ceremonial law. This meaning might, in respect of its connection with these, have been ranked in the third place. But, because I consider this as originally a metaphorical use of the word, and requiring a greater degree of refinement than the other meanings, I have reserved it for the last. This acceptation is accordingly much more frequent in the New Testament than in the Old. In the latter, it oftener occurs in the prophetic and devotional writings, than in the Pentateuch, and the other historical books, where we never find *holy* mentioned in the description of a good character. This, in my judgment, merits a more particular attention than seems to have been given it. In what is affirmed expressly in commendation of Noah, Abraham, or any of the Patriarchs, of Moses, Joshua, Job, David, Hezekiah, or any of the good kings of Israel or Judah, or any of the Prophets or ancient worthies, except where there is an allusion to a sacred office, the term *kadosh*, holy, is not once employed. Now there is hardly another general term, as *just, good, perfect, upright*, whereof, in such cases, we do not find examples. Yet there is no epithet which occurs oftener, on other occasions, than that whereof I am speaking. But, in the time of the Evangelists, this moral application of the

corresponding word *hagios* was become more familiar; though the other meanings were not obsolete, as they are almost all at present. Herod is said to have known that John the Baptist *was a just man and a holy*¹⁷⁹. There is nothing like this in all the Old Testament. When David pleads that he is *holy*¹⁸⁰, it is not the word *kadosh* that he uses. The many injunctions to holiness given in the law, as has been already hinted, have at least a much greater reference to ceremonial purity, than to moral. The only immorality, against which they sometimes seem immediately pointed, is *idolatry*, it being always considered, in the law, as the greatest degree of defilement in both senses, ceremonial and moral.

But, as every vicious action is a transgression of the law, holiness came gradually to be opposed to vice of every kind. The consideration of this, as a stain on the character, as what sullies the mind, and renders it similarly disagreeable to a virtuous man, as dirt renders the body to a cleanly man, has been common in most nations. Metaphors, drawn hence, are to be found, perhaps, in every language. As the ideas of a people become more spiritual and refined, and, which is a natural consequence, as ceremonies sink in their estimation, and virtue rises, the secondary and metaphorical use of such terms grows more habitual, and often, in the end, supplants the primitive and proper. This has happened to the term *holiness*, as now commonly understood by Chris-

¹⁷⁹ Mark, vi. 20.

¹⁸⁰ Psal. lxxxvi. 2.

tians, or rather to the original terms so rendered. It had, in a good measure, happened, but not entirely, in the language of the Jews, in the days of our Lord and his Apostles. The exhortations to holiness, in the New Testament, are evidently to be understood of moral purity, and of that only. On other occasions, the words *holy*, and *saints*, *ἅγιοι*, even in the New Testament, ought to be explained in conformity to the fourth meaning above assigned, devoted or consecrated to the service of God.

§ 16. HAVING illustrated these different senses, I shall consider an objection that may be offered against the interpretation here given of the word *holy*, when applied to God, as denoting *awful*, *venerable*. Is not, it may be said, the imitation of God, in holiness, enjoined as a duty? And does not this imply, that the thing itself must be the same in nature, how different soever in degree, when ascribed to God, and when enjoined on us? As I did not entirely exclude this sense, to wit, *moral purity*, from the term, when applied to the Deity, I readily admit that, in this injunction in the New Testament, there may be a particular reference to it. But it is not necessary, that, in such sentences, there be so perfect a coincidence of signification, as seems, in the objection, to be contended for. The words are, *Be ye holy, for (not as) I am holy*. In the passage where this precept first occurs, it is manifest, from the context, that the scope of the

charge given to the people, is to avoid ceremonial impurities; those particularly that may be contracted by eating unclean meats, and above all, by eating insects and reptiles, which are called an abomination. Now, certainly, in this inferior acceptation, the term is utterly inapplicable to God: But what entirely removes the difficulty, is, that the people are said, by a participation in such unclean food, to make themselves abominable. To this the precept, *Sanctify yourselves, and be ye holy*, stands in direct opposition. There is here, therefore, a coincidence of the second and fifth meanings of the word *holy*, which are connected, in their application to men, as the means and the end, and therefore ought both to be understood as comprehended; though the latter alone is applicable to God. Now, as the opposite of abominable is *estimable, venerable*, the import of the precept, *Sanctify yourselves*, manifestly is, ‘Be
‘ careful, by a strict attention to the statutes ye
‘ have received concerning purity, especially in
‘ what regards your food, to avoid the pollution
‘ of your body; maintain thus a proper respect for
‘ your persons, that your religious services may
‘ be esteemed by men, and accepted of God; for
‘ remember that the God whom ye serve, as being
‘ pure and perfect, is entitled to the highest es-
‘ teem and veneration. Whatever, therefore, may
‘ be called *slovenly*, or what his law has pronounc-
‘ ed impure in his servants, is an indignity offered
‘ by them to their master, which he will certainly
‘ resent.’

But as an artful gloss or paraphrase will sometimes mislead, I shall subjoin the plain words of Scripture ¹⁸¹, which come in the conclusion of a long chapter, wherein the laws relating to cleanliness in animal food, in beasts, birds, fishes, and reptiles, are laid down. *Whatsoever goeth upon the belly, and whatsoever goeth upon all four, or whatsoever hath more feet among all creeping things, that creep upon the earth; them ye shall not eat, for they are an abomination. Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby. For I am the Lord your God; ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.* It is plain that any other interpretation of the word *holy* than that now given, would render the whole passage incoherent.

§ 17. Now, to come to the word חַסִּיד *chacid*, ὁσιος, this is a term which properly and originally expresses a mental quality, and that only, in the same manner as צַדִּיק *tsaddik*, δίκαιος *just*, אֱמוּנָה *amon*, πιστος *faithful*, and several others. Nor is there any material variation of meaning that the word seems to have undergone at different pe-

¹⁸¹ Lev. xi. 42, &c.

riods. The most common acceptation is, *humane, merciful, beneficent, benign*. When there appears to be a particular reference to the way wherein the person stands affected to God and religion, it means *pious, devout*. In conformity to this sense, our translators have, in several places in the Old Testament, rendered it *godly*. The phrase *οἱ ὅσιοι τοῦ Θεοῦ* is, therefore, not improperly rendered *the saints of God*, that is, his pious servants. It most probably, as was hinted before, means *pious* in what is said of our Lord, that he was *ὁσῖος, ἀκακος, ἀμιαντος*, as it seems to have been the intention of the sacred writer to comprehend, in few words, his whole moral character respecting God, the rest of mankind, and himself. In the enumeration which Paul gives to Titus ¹⁸², of the virtues whereof a bishop ought to be possessed, it is surely improper to explain any of them by a general term equally adapted to them all; since nothing can be plainer than that his intention is to denote, by every epithet, some quality not expressed before. His words are *φιλοξενον, φιλαγαθον, σωφρονα, δικαιον, ὁσιον, εγκρατη*. To render *ὁσιον* *holy* (though that were in other places a proper version) would be here in effect the same as to omit it altogether. If the sense had been *pious*, it had probably been either the first or the last in the catalogue. As it stands, I think it ought to be rendered *humane*.

There are certain words which on some occasions, are used with greater, and on others, with

¹⁸² Titus, i. 8.

less, latitude. Thus the word *δικαιος* sometimes comprehends the whole of our duty to God, our neighbour, and ourselves; sometimes it includes only the virtue of justice. When *οι δικαιοι* is opposed to *οι πονηροι*, the former is the case, and it is better to render it *the righteous*, and *δικαιοσυνη* *righteousness*; but when *δικαιος* or *δικαιοσυνη* occur in a list with other virtues, it is better to render them *just* or *justice*. Sometimes the word is employed in a sense which has been called forensic, as being derived from judicial proceedings. *He that justifieth the wicked*, says Solomon¹⁸³, *and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord*. The word *wicked*, means no more here than *guilty*, and the word *just*, *guiltless* of the crime charged. In like manner *οσιους*, in one or two instances, may be found in the New Testament, in an extent of signification greater than usual. In such cases it may be rendered *sanctity*, a word rather more expressive of what concerns manners than *holiness* is.

§ 18. BUT, as a further evidence that the Hebrew word *חסיד* *chased*, is not synonymous with *קדוש* *kadosh*, and consequently neither *οσιος* with *αγιος*, it must be observed, that the abstract *חסד* *chesed*, is not once rendered by the Seventy *οσιους*, or, by our interpreters, *holiness*, though the concrete is almost always rendered *οσιος* in Greek, and often *holy* in English. This substantive, on the

¹⁸³ Prov. xvii. 15.

contrary, is translated in the Septuagint, *ελεος, ελεημοσυνη, οικτειρημα, ελπις, χαρις*, or some such term; once, indeed, and but once, *οσια*. In English it is translated *kindness, favour, grace, mercy, loving-kindness, pity*, but never *holiness*. The analogy of language, (unless use were clear against it, which is not the case here) would lead us to think, that there must be a nearer relation in meaning than this, between the substantive and the adjective formed from it. Yet *worthy* does not more evidently spring from *worth*, than *חַסִּיד chasid*, springs from *חֶסֶד chesed*. Of the term last mentioned it may be proper just to observe, that there is also an anomalous use (like that remarked in *kadosh*,) which assigns it a meaning, the reverse of its usual signification, answering to *ανομια, ονειδος, flagitium, probrum*. But it is only in two or three places that the word occurs in this acceptance.

§ 19. I SHALL conclude with observing, that *chasid* or *hosios* is sometimes applied to God; in which case, there can be little doubt of its implying *merciful, bountiful, gracious, liberal, or benign*. The only case, wherein it has an affinity in meaning to the English words *saint* or *holy*, is when it expresses pious affections towards God. As these cannot be attributed to God himself, the term, when used of him, ought to be understood, according to its most frequent acceptance. The Psalmist's words, which, in the common version, are¹⁸⁴, *The Lord is righteous in all*

¹⁸⁴ Psal. cxlv. 17.

his ways, and holy, chasid, in all his works, would have been more truly, as well as intelligibly and emphatically rendered, *The Lord is just in all his ways, and bountiful in all his works.* There is not equal reason for translating in the same manner the Greek *hosios*, when applied to God in the New Testament. Though *hosios*, in the Septuagint, commonly occupies the place of *chasid*, it does not always. It is sometimes employed in translating the Hebrew words תָּם *tham*, *perfect*, and יָשָׁר *jasher*, *upright*. Once it is used for this last term when applied to God¹⁸⁵. Those words, therefore, ὅτι μόνος ὁσῖος¹⁸⁶, in an address to God, ought to be translated, *for thou alone art perfect*, rather than *bountiful* or *gracious*. The addition of *μόνος* to the other epithet, is a sufficient ground for this preference. The context also favours it. But, in the more common acceptation of the term ὁσῖος *hosios*, there is this difference between it and ἅγιος *hagios*, as applied to God, that the latter appellation represents the Deity as awful, or rather terrible; the former as amiable. The latter checks all advances on our part. We are ready to cry with the men of Bethshemesh¹⁸⁷, *Who is able to stand before this holy God?* The former emboldens us to approach. Thus they are so far from being synonymous in this application, that they may rather be contrasted with each other. As to their import, when applied to men, the word ἅγιος, in

¹⁸⁵ Deut. xxxii. 4.¹⁸⁶ Rev. xv. 4.¹⁸⁷ 1 Sam. vi. 20.

the best sense, still retains so much of its origin, as to appear rather a negative character, denoting a mind without stain ; whereas the term *ᾀσιος* is properly positive, and implies, in its utmost extent, both piety and benevolence.

§ 20. IN regard to the manner of translating *kadosh* in the Old Testament, and *hagios* in the New ; when all circumstances are considered, I think it safest to retain very generally the common version *holy*. The same remark holds nearly also of the conjugates. It is very true that the sense of the original, in many places, does not entirely suit the meaning which we affix to that word. But it is certain, on the other hand, that we have no one word that answers so well in all cases. To change the term with each variation in meaning, would be attended with great inconveniency, and, in many cases, oblige the translator to express himself either unintelligibly, and, to appearance, inconsequentially, or too much in the manner of the paraphrast. On the other hand, as the English term *holy* is somewhat indefinite in respect of meaning, and in a manner appropriated to religious subjects, nothing can serve better to ascertain and illustrate the scriptural use than such uniformity ; and the scriptural use of a word hardly current in common discourse, cannot fail to fix the general acceptation. But this would not hold of any words, in familiar use, on ordinary subjects. With regard to such, any deviation from the received meaning would, to common readers, prove the occasion of perplexity at least, if not

of error. But *chasic* in the Old Testament, and *hosios* in the New (except when used substantively, where it may be rendered *saint*,) ought, when it respects the disposition towards God, to be translated *pious*; when it respects the disposition towards men, *gracious, kind, humane*.

PART V.

Κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, AND διδασκειν.

THE only other specimen I shall here give of words supposed to be synonymous, or nearly so, shall be *κηρυσσειν, ευαγγελιζειν, καταγγελλειν, and διδασκειν* all nearly related, the former three being almost always rendered in English *to preach*, and the last *to teach*. My intention is, not only to point out exactly the differences of meaning in these words, but to evince that the words whereby the two former are rendered in some, perhaps most, modern languages, do not entirely reach the meaning of the original terms; and, in some measure, by consequence, mislead most readers. It happens, in a tract of ages, through the gradual alterations which take place in laws, manners,

rites, and customs, that words come, as it were, along with these, by imperceptible degrees, to vary considerably from their primitive signification. Perhaps it is oftener than we are aware, to be ascribed to this cause, that the terms employed by translators, are found so feebly to express the meaning of the original.

§ 2. THE first of the words above mentioned, *κηρυσσειν*, rendered *to preach*, is derived from *κηρυξ*, rendered *preacher*, whence also *κηρυγμα*, rendered *a preaching*. The primitive *κηρυξ* signifies properly both *herald* and *common crier*, and answers exactly to the Latin word *caduceator* in the first of these senses, and to *præco* in the second. The verb *κηρυσσειν* is accordingly *to cry, publish, or proclaim* authoritatively, or by commission from another, and the noun *κηρυγμα* is *the thing published or proclaimed*. The word *κηρυξ* occurs only twice in the Septuagint, and once in the apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus, and evidently means in them all *crier*. The other sense of the word, namely, *herald*, or messenger of important intelligence between princes and states, is nearly related, as the same persons had often the charge of carrying such embassies, and of proclaiming war or peace: but it is not quite the same. In the New Testament the word seems to partake of both senses, but more evidently of that of *crier*. And to this sense the derivatives *κηρυσσω* and *κηρυγμα*, more properly accord than to the other: for, to discharge the

office of herald is, in Greek, *κηρυκευειν*, and the office itself *κηρυκευσις*. But these words, though frequent in classical writers, are not found in Scripture. The word *κηρυξ* occurs but thrice in the New Testament, once in each of the Epistles to Timothy¹⁸⁸, wherein Paul calls himself *κηρυξ και αποστολος*; and once it is used by the Apostle Peter, who, speaking of Noah, calls him¹⁸⁹ *κηρυξ δικαιοσυνης*. The word *κηρυγμα* occurs but in three places in the Septuagint, and imports in them all *proclamation* or *thing proclaimed*. In one of those places it relates to that made by the Prophet Jonah, through the streets of Nineveh, called, as in the Gospel, *preaching*¹⁹⁰, and in another¹⁹¹, is, in the common version, rendered *proclamation*. In the New Testament it occurs eight times, and is always rendered *preaching*. In two of those places it relates to Jonah's proclamation in Nineveh. The verb *κηρυσσω* occurs in the New Testament about five and twenty times, always in nearly the same sense: *I proclaim, prædico, palam annuncio*. In at least twelve of these cases it relates solely to proclamations made by human authority, and denotes in them all *to warn*, or, by crying out, to advertise people openly of any thing done or to be done, or danger to be avoided. This may be called the primitive sense of the word, and in this sense it will be found to be oftenest employed in the New Testament.

¹⁸⁸ 1 Tim. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11.

¹⁸⁹ 2 Pet. ii. 5.

¹⁹⁰ Jonah, iii. 2.

¹⁹¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22.

§ 3. Now if it be asked, whether this suits the import of the English word, *to preach*, by which it is almost always rendered in the common version of this part of the canon, I answer that, in my judgment, it does not entirely suit it. *To preach*, is defined, by Johnson, in his Dictionary, “to pronounce a public discourse upon sacred subjects.” This expresses, with sufficient exactness, the idea we commonly affix to the term. For, we may admit, that the attendant circumstances of church, pulpit, text, worship, are but appendages. But the definition, given by the English lexicographer, cannot be called an interpretation of the term *κηρυσσω*, as used in Scripture. For, so far is it from being necessary that the *κηρυγμα* should be a discourse, that it may be only a single sentence, and a very short sentence too. Nay, to such brief notifications we shall find the term most frequently applied. Besides the word *κηρυσσω*, and *κηρυγμα*, were adopted, with equal propriety, whether the subject were sacred or civil. Again, though the verb *κηρυσσω* always implied public notice of some event, either accomplished, or about to be accomplished, often accompanied with a warning; to do or forbear something; it never denoted either a comment on, or explanation of, any doctrine, critical observations on, or illustrations of, any subject, or a chain of reasoning, in proof of a particular sentiment. And, if so, to pronounce publicly such a discourse as, with us, is denominated sermon, homily, lecture, or preaching, would,

by no means, come within the meaning of the word *κηρυσσω*, in its first and common acceptation. It is, therefore, not so nearly synonymous with *διδασκω*, *I teach*, as is now commonly imagined.

§ 4. BUT, that we may be more fully satisfied of this, it will be necessary to examine more closely the application of the word in the Gospels, and in the Acts. The first time it occurs, is in the account that is given of our Lord's harbinger¹⁹². *In those days came John the Baptist, κηρυσσων εν τη ερημω της Ιουδαιας, και λεγων, making proclamation in the wilderness of Judea, and saying.* Now, what was it that he cried, or proclaimed in the wilderness? It immediately follows, *Μετανοειτε ηγγικε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων. Reform; for the reign of heaven approacheth.* This is, literally, his *κηρυγμα*, proclamation, or preaching, stripped of the allegorical language in which it is clothed by the Prophet¹⁹³, as quoted in the next verse, to this effect: *For this is he to whom Isaiah alludeth in these words, The cry of a crier in the desert, "Prepare a way for the Lord, make his road "straight."* Hence we may learn, what the Evangelists call *βαπτισμα μετανοιας*, which John preached for the remission of sins. He proclaimed to all within hearing, that if they would obtain the pardon of former offences, they must now enter on a new life; for that the reign of the Messiah was just about to commence; and, as a pledge of their

¹⁹² Matth. iii. 1, 2.

¹⁹³ Isa. xl. 3.

intended reformation, and an engagement to it, he called on all to come and be baptized by him, confessing their sins.

Another public intimation, which John made to the people, and to which the word *κηρυσσω* is also applied, we have in Mark ¹⁹⁴: *He proclaimed, saying, "After me cometh one mightier than I, whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. I indeed baptize you in water, but he will baptize you in the holy Spirit."* Such short calls, warnings, notices, or advertisements, given with a loud voice to the multitude, from whomsoever, and on what subject soever, come under the notion of *κηρυγματα*, as used in Scripture. To the particular moral instructions which John gave the people severally, according to their different professions, the word *κηρυσσειν* is not applied, but *παρακαλειν*, to admonish, to exhort ¹⁹⁵. *Πολλα μιν ον και ετερα παρακαλων ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον*. Which is very improperly translated, *And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people*. *Πολλα* is manifestly construed with *παρακαλων*, not with *ευηγγελιζετο*, whose only regimen is *τον λαον*. The meaning is therefore: *Accompanied with many other exhortations, he published the good news to the people*.

§ 5. LET US next consider in what manner the term *κηρυσσω* is applied to our Saviour. The first time we find it used of him ¹⁹⁶, the very same

¹⁹⁴ i. 7, 8.

¹⁹⁵ Luke, iii. 18.

¹⁹⁶ Matth. iv. 17.

proclamation or preaching is ascribed to him, which had been ascribed to John the Baptist. *Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.* With giving this public notice he also began his ministry. Again, we are told¹⁹⁷, that *he went over all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας, proclaiming the good news of the reign.* There can be no doubt that the same proclamation is here meant, which is quoted above from the same chapter. Nor is this the only place wherein this expression is used of our Lord¹⁹⁸. Again, it is applied to Jesus Christ by the Prophet Isaiah¹⁹⁹, as quoted in the Gospel²⁰⁰, as to which I shall only observe at present (having made some remarks on the passage in the preceding Dissertation²⁰¹;) that the word κηρυσσω, which twice occurs in it, is used solely in relation to those things which were wont to be notified by proclamation. In the last clause, *to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord*, there is a manifest allusion to the jubilee, which was always proclaimed by sound of trumpet, and accompanied with a proclamation of liberty to all the bondmen and bondwomen among them. It was by proclamation, also, that Cyrus gave freedom to the captives of Judah, to return to their native land. I need only add, that the word κηρυσσω is sometimes applied to our Lord indefinitely, where we are not told what he *proclaimed* or *preached*. In such cases, the rules of inter-

¹⁹⁷ Matth. iv. 23.

¹⁹⁸ Matth. ix. 35. Mark, i. 14.

¹⁹⁹ lxi. 1, &c.

²⁰⁰ Luke, iv. 18, 19.

²⁰¹ P. II. § 2.

pretation invariably require, that the expressions which are indefinite and defective, be explained by those which are definite and full; and that, by consequence, they be understood to signify, that he gave public warning of the Messiah's approaching reign.

§ 6. LASTLY, as to the application of the term to the Apostles: its first appearance is in the instructions which their Lord gave them, along with their first mission to the cities and villages of Israel. *As ye go*, says he²⁰², *κηρυσσετε λεγοντες, proclaim, saying, ηγγικε η βασιλεια των ουρανων, the reign of heaven approacheth.* Here we have the very words of their preaching, or proclamation, expressly given them. To the same purpose, another Evangelist tells us²⁰³, *Απεστειλεν αυτους κηρυσσειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου*, which is literally, *He commissioned them to proclaim the reign of God.* The same is doubtless to be understood by Mark, who acquaints us²⁰⁴, *Εξελθοντες εκηρυσσον ινα μετανοησωσι*; which is saying, in effect, that wherever they went they made the same proclamation, which had been made by their Master, and his precursor, before them. *Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.* Now, it deserves our notice, that we nowhere find such an order as *διδασκετε λεγοντες, teach saying*, where the express words of their teaching are prescribed. It was necessary that this should differ in

²⁰² Matth. x. 7.²⁰³ Luke, ix. 2.²⁰⁴ vi. 12.

manner, according to the occasion, and be suited to the capacities and circumstances of the persons to be taught, and therefore, that it should be left to the discretion of the teacher. No variation was necessary, or even proper, in the other, which was no more than the public notification of a fact, with a warning to prepare themselves.

In the charge which our Lord gave to his Apostles, after his resurrection, he says²⁰⁵, *Go throughout all the world, κηρυξανε το ευαγγελιον, proclaim the good news to the whole creation.* And as the call to reformation was enforced by the promise of remission in the name of Christ, these are also said²⁰⁶ *κηρυχθηναι εις παντα τα εθνη, to have been proclaimed to all nations.* Indemnity for past sins is the foundation of the call to reform, with which the proclamation of the reign of God was always accompanied. It is proper to remark, that the form, *ηγγικε γαρ*, used first by the Baptist, then by our Lord himself, and lastly, by his disciples in his lifetime, is never repeated after his resurrection. And we have reason to believe, from the material alteration in circumstances which then took place, that they have then said, not as formerly, *ηγγικε* but *ηλθε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων.* *The reign of heaven, that is, of the Messiah, is come.*

§ 7. FURTHER, I must take notice, that though announcing publicly the reign of the Messiah,

²⁰⁵ Mark, xvi. 15.

²⁰⁶ Luke, xxiv. 47.

comes always under the denomination, *κηρυσσειν*, no moral instructions, or doctrinal explanations, given either by our Lord, or by his Apostles, are ever, either in the Gospels, or in the Acts, so denominated. Thus, that most instructive discourse of our Lord, the longest that is recorded in the Gospel, commonly named his sermon on the mount, is called teaching by the Evangelists, both in introducing it, and after the conclusion²⁰⁷.

Opening his mouth, εδιδασκεν αυτους, he taught them, saying : and, *when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished, επι τη διδαχη αυτου, at his doctrine,* his manner of teaching. It is added, *ην γαρ διδασκων αυτους ; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.* He is said to have been employed in teaching²⁰⁸, when the wisdom, which shone forth in his discourses, excited the astonishment of all who heard him. In like manner, the instructions he gave by parables, are called teaching the people, not preaching to them²⁰⁹ ; and those given in private to his Apostles, are in the same way styled²¹⁰ teaching, never preaching. And if teaching and preaching be found sometimes coupled together, the reason appears to be, because their teaching, in the beginning of this new dispensation, must have been frequently introduced by announcing the Messiah, which alone was preaching. The explanations, admonitions, arguments, and motives, that followed, came under the

²⁰⁷ Matth. v. 2. vii. 28, 29.

²⁰⁸ Matth. xiii. 54. Mark, vi. 2. Luke, iv. 15. 22.

²⁰⁹ Mark, iv. 1, 2.

²¹⁰ Mark, viii. 31.

denomination of teaching. Nor does any thing else, spoken by our Lord and his disciples, in his lifetime, appear to have been called preaching, but this single sentence, *Μετανοειτε· ηγγικε γαρ η βασιλεια των ουρανων*. In the Acts of the Apostles, the difference of meaning in the two words is carefully observed. The former is always a general and open declaration of the Messiah's reign, called emphatically, the good news, or gospel; or, which amounts to the same, the announcing of the great foundation of our hope, the Messiah's resurrection: the latter comprehends every kind of instruction, public or private, that is necessary for illustrating the nature and laws of this kingdom, for confuting gainsayers, persuading the hearers, for confirming and comforting believers. The proper subject of each is fitly expressed in the conclusion of this book²¹¹; where, speaking of Paul, then confined at Rome, in a hired house, the author tells us, that he received all who came to him, *κηρυσσων την βασιλειαν του Θεου, και διδασκων τα περι του Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου*. Announcing to them the reign of God, and instructing them in every thing that related to the Lord Jesus Christ.

§ 8. LET it also be observed that, in all the quotations in the Gospels, from the ancient Prophets, neither the word *κηρυσσω*, nor any of its conjugates, is applied to any of them beside Jonah. What is quoted from the rest, is said to

²¹¹ Acts, xxviii. 31.

have been spoken, or foretold, or prophesied, but never *preached*. Jonah's prophecy to the Ninivites, on the contrary, is but twice quoted; and it is in both places called *κηρυγμα*, rendered *preaching*, properly *cry*, or *proclamation*. The same name it has, in the book itself, in the Septuagint, and with great propriety, according to the explanation above given of the word, for it was a real proclamation which God required him to make through the streets of Niniveh. Thus he is charged²¹², *Go to Niniveh, that great city, and preach to it the preaching that I bid thee*. The very words are prescribed. It may be observed here, by the way, that both in the Hebrew, and in the Greek, it is the same word which is here rendered *preach*, and in verse fifth, *proclaim*, when used in reference to a fast appointed by the king of Niniveh, for averting the divine anger, and notified to the people by *proclamation*. In obedience to the command of God, Jonah began to enter into the city, a day's journey, and to cry, as he had been bidden. Now, what was the *preaching* which God put into his mouth? It was neither more nor less than this, *Yet forty days, and Niniveh shall be overthrown*. This warning the Prophet, at proper distances, repeated as he advanced.

In one passage of the Apocalypse²¹³, the word occurs so manifestly in the same sense, that it is one of the two places (for there are no more) in the New Testament, wherein our translators have

²¹² Jonah, iii. 2.²¹³ Rev. v. 2.

rendered it *proclaim* : *I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?* That is, whosoever is worthy to open the book and to loose its seals, may come and do it. This is the whole of the angel's *κηρυγμα*, preaching or proclamation. In the Acts and Epistles, we find the verb *κηρυσσω* followed by *τον Χριστον, τον Ιησουν*, or something equivalent. This is entirely proper. To proclaim the advent of the Messiah, and that Jesus is the person, was the first step of their important charge, and necessarily preceded their teaching and explaining his doctrine, or inculcating his precepts.

§ 9. So much for the primitive and most common meaning of the word *κηρυσσω* in the New Testament. But, as few words in any language remain perfectly univocal, I own there are some instances in which the term is employed in this part of Scripture with greater latitude. The first and most natural extension of the word is when it is used by hyperbole for publishing any how, divulging, making a thing to be universally talked of. The first instance of this is where we are told of the leper that was cleansed by our Lord, and charged not to divulge the manner of his cure. *But he went out*, says the historian²¹⁴, *and began to publish it much, κηρυσσειν πολλα*. So our translators, very properly, render the word. In some other places we find it in the same sense,

²¹⁴ Mark, i. 45.

and in the same way rendered²¹⁵. All the instances are similar, in that they relate to miraculous cures performed by our Lord, which some of those who received, notwithstanding the prohibition given them, were every where assiduous to divulge. Not that they did literally proclaim them, by crying aloud in the public places, but that they made the matter as well known, as though this method had been taken. Such hyperbolical idioms are to be found in all languages. How common is it to say of profligates, that they proclaim their infamy to all the world? because their lives make it as notorious, as it could be made by proclamation. It is in the same sense of publishing, and by the same figure, that proclaiming from the house-tops²¹⁶ is opposed to whispering in the ear. Nor is it certain, that the words *κηρυσσω* and *κηρυγμα* have any other meaning than those above specified in the Gospels and Acts.

§ 10. THE only remaining sense of the words which I find in the New Testament, and which answers to the import of the English words, *preach* and *preaching*, seems to be peculiar to the writings of Paul. *Thou*, says he²¹⁷, *who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?* *Thou that preachest, ὁ κηρυσσων, a man should not steal, dost thou steal?* The two clauses illustrate each other, and show that *κηρυσσω* in the latter has nearly the

²¹⁵ Matth. x. 27. Luke, xii. 3.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Rom. ii. 21.

same import with *διδασκω* in the former. For, though we may speak properly of proclaiming laws, and *thou shalt not steal*, is doubtless of the number; it is only of laws newly enacted, or at least not before promulgated, that we use that expression. The law here spoken of was sufficiently known and acknowledged every where; but, though there was no occasion for proclaiming it, it might be very necessary to inculcate and explain it. Now this is properly expressed by the word *preach*. There are some other places in his epistles, wherein it cannot be doubted, that the word is used in this large acceptation for teaching publicly. Thus we ought to understand his admonition to Timothy²¹⁸, *κηρυσσον τον λογον, preach the word*. *Κηρυγμα* is also used by him, with the same latitude, for all public teaching, as when he says²¹⁹, *It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, δια της μωριας του κηρυγματος, to save them that believe*. Again²²⁰, *My speech and my preaching, το κηρυγμα μου, was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the spirit and of power*; there can be no question but the term is used for teaching in general, since *κηρυγμα*, in the confined sense it bears in the Gospels, could hardly admit variety or choice in the expression, nor consequently aught of the enticing words of man's wisdom. There is, besides, one place, where the Apostle Peter uses the word *κηρυσσειν*²²¹, in speaking of

²¹⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 2.²¹⁹ 1 Cor. i. 21.²²⁰ 1 Cor. ii. 4.²²¹ 1 Pet. iii. 19.

our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison: but the passage is so obscure, that no argument can safely be founded on it.

§ 11. NOTHING, however, can be clearer to the attentive and critical reader of the original, than that the aforesaid words are not used with the same latitude in the historical books. In the Acts, in particular, several discourses are recorded, those especially of Peter and Paul, but to none of them are the terms *κηρυσσω* and *κηρυγμα* ever applied. I think it the more necessary to make this remark, because the English word *preach* is in the common version frequently applied to them. Now this tends to confound the distinction so well preserved in the history, and to render all our ideas on this head extremely indeterminate. Some will, perhaps, be surprised to be informed that there are, in the Acts alone, no fewer than six Greek words (not synonymous neither) which are (some of them oftener, some of them seldomer) translated by the verb *preach*. The words are *κηρυσσω*, *ευαγγελιζομαι*, *καταγγελλω*, *λαλεω*, *διαλεγομαι*, and *παρορησιαζομαι*, which last is rendered *I preach boldly*. I admit that it is impossible, in translating out of one language into another, to find a distinction of words in one exactly correspondent to what obtains in the other, and so to preserve uniformity, in rendering every different word by a different word, and the same word by the same word. This is what neither propriety nor perspicuity will admit. The rule, however, to translate uniformly, when it

can be done, in a consistency both with propriety and perspicuity, is a good rule, and one of the simplest and surest methods I know, of making us enter into the conceptions of the sacred writers, and adopt their very turn of thinking.

§ 12. I SHALL here take notice only of two passages in the common translation, which, to a reader unacquainted with the original, may appear to contradict my remark in regard to the distinction so carefully observed by the historian. *When the Jews, says he*²²², *were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought, that these words might be preached to them, λαληθῆναι αυτοις τα ῥηματα ταυτα, the next Sabbath; literally and simply, that these words might be spoken to them.* The words here meant, are those contained in the twenty-six preceding verses. Our translators, I suppose, have been the more inclinable to call it preaching, because spoken in a synagogue by permission of the rulers. In another place²²³, *when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, διελεγετο αυτοις.* Soon after²²⁴, *as Paul was long preaching, διαλεγομενου επι πλειον.* Διαλεγομαι is properly *dissero, disputo.* It occurs frequently in the Acts, but, except in this passage, is always rendered *to reason, or to dispute.* I own that neither of these words suits the context here, as it appears that all present were disciples. The word, however, implies not only *to dispute, but to discourse* on any

²²² Acts, xiii. 42.²²³ Acts, xx. 7.²²⁴ 9.

subject. But what I take the freedom to censure in our translators, is not their rendering *διαλεγομαι* in this place *preach*, which, considered by itself, might be justified; but it is their confounding it with so many words not synonymous, particularly with *κηρυσσω*, whose meaning, in this book, as well as in the Gospels, is totally different.

§ 13. Now, in regard to the manner wherein this word has been translated, with which I shall finish what relates peculiarly to it, we may observe, that *prædicare*, used in the Vulgate, and in all the Latin versions, corresponds entirely to the Greek word in its primitive meaning, and signifies to give public notice by proclamation. In this sense it had been used by the Latin classics, long before the translation of the Bible into their tongue. But *prædicare*, having been employed uniformly in rendering *κηρυσσειν*, not only in the history, but in the Epistles, has derived, from the latter use, a signification different, and much more limited than it has in profane authors. Now this additional, or acquired signification, is that which has principally obtained amongst ecclesiastics; and hence has arisen the sole meaning in modern languages ascribed to the word, whereby they commonly render the Greek *κηρυσσω*. The Latin word is manifestly that from which the Italian *predicare*, the French *precher*, and the English *to preach*, are derived. Yet these three words correspond to the Latin, only in the last mentioned

and ecclesiastical sense, not in the primitive and classical, which is also the scriptural sense in the Gospels and Acts. Thus the learned Academicians della Crusca, in their Vocabulary, interpret the Italian *predicare*, not by the Latin *prædicare*, its etymon, but by *concionari*, *concionem habere*; terms certainly much nearer than the other to the import of the word used in the other two languages mentioned, though by no means adapted to express the sense of *κηρυσσειν* in the historical books. This is another evidence of what was observed in a former Dissertation²²⁵, that a mistake, occasioned by supposing the word in the original, exactly correspondent to the term in the common version, by which it is usually rendered, is often confirmed, instead of being corrected by recurring to translations into other modern tongues, inasmuch as from the same, or similar causes, the like deviation from the original import, has been produced in these languages, as in our own.

§ 14. I SHOULD NOW examine critically the import of the word *ευαγγελιζω*, often rendered in the same way with *κηρυσσω*. But what might have been offered on this subject, I have in a great measure anticipated, in the explanation I gave of the name *ευαγγελιον*. It would have been impossible to consider the noun and the verb separately, without either repeating the same observations

²²⁵ Diss. II. P. III. § 6.

and criticisms on each, or, by dividing things so closely connected, injuring the illustration of both. I shall therefore here, after referring the reader to that Dissertation ²²⁶, which is pretty full, point out, in the briefest manner, the chief distinctions in meaning, that may be remarked between this word, and *κηρυσσω*, already explained.

The former always refers to a message or news in itself good and agreeable, the latter does not require this quality in the subject. What would come under the denomination of *κακαγγελια* *bad news*, may be the subject of *κηρυγμα*, *proclamation*, as well as good news. We say, with equal propriety, *κηρυσσειν πολεμον* as *κηρυσσειν ειρηνην*, to proclaim war, as to proclaim peace. Nay, Jonah's cry through the streets of Niniveh, *Yet forty days and Niniveh shall be overthrown*, is denominated *κηρυγμα* both in the Old Testament and in the New. But this is no where, nor indeed could be, styled *ευαγγελιον* *glad tidings*.

A second difference is, the word *κηρυσσω* implies that the notification is made openly to many, whereas the word *ευαγγελιζομαι* may not improperly be used, in whatever way the thing be notified, publicly or privately, aloud or in a whisper, to one or to many. Thus, in regard to the important and agreeable message delivered by Gabriel to Zacharias the father of John the Baptist, when the latter was alone in the sanctuary offering

²²⁶ Diss. V. Part II.

incense; the archangel says ²²⁷, *I am sent, εὐαγγελισασθαι σοι ταυτα, to show thee these glad tidings.* And it is said of Philip, when in the chariot with only the Ethiopian eunuch ²²⁸, *εὐηγγελισατο αυτω τον Ιησουν. He preached to him Jesus.* The term *preached*, by which our translators have rendered the word, does not in this place reach the meaning of the Greek word, nor does it answer to the ordinary acceptation of the English. It does not reach the meaning of the Greek, as the quality of the subject, its being good news, is not suggested. Nor is the English word proper here; for this teaching was neither public, nor have we reason to believe it was a continued discourse. It is much more probable, that it was in the familiar way of dialogue, in which he had begun, that Philip continued to instruct this stranger in the doctrine of Christ.

Another distinction seems to arise from the original import of the words, though I will not say that it is uniformly observed. It is, that the word *εὐαγγελιζη* relates to the first information that is given to a person or people, that is, when the subject may be properly called *news*. Thus, in the Acts, it is frequently used for expressing the first publication of the Gospel in a city or village, or amongst a particular people. In regard to the word *κηρυσσω*, there is no impropriety in speaking of the same thing as repeatedly proclaimed among the same people. Thus the approach of the reign of God

²²⁷ Luke, i. 19.

²²⁸ Acts, viii. 35.

was, in fact, proclaimed to the Jews in our Saviour's lifetime, first by the Baptist, then by our Lord himself, afterwards by the Apostles, and lastly by the seventy disciples. I shall only add, that the word *εὐαγγελίζομαι* is sometimes, though not often, used more indefinitely for teaching and preaching in general²²⁹. In one place²³⁰, it is rendered by our translators *declared*. But in the Gospels, it always preserves the primitive signification. When, therefore, we find it there coupled with the verb *διδασκω*, we are not to understand the terms as synonymous, but as intended to acquaint us that the teaching mentioned was accompanied, or perhaps introduced, with an intimation of the approaching reign of the Messiah.

The most obvious things are sometimes the most apt to be overlooked by ingenious men. We should otherwise think it unaccountable that men, eminent for their attainments in sacred literature, should be so far misled by the ordinary meaning of a phrase in the translation, as entirely to forget the proper import of the original expression. I am led to this reflection by observing, in a late publication²³¹, the following remark on Luke xx. 1. “*Διδασκοντος αυτου—και ευαγγελιζομενου*. Why this specification of *preaching the gospel*? Did he not always *preach the gospel* when *he taught the people*? Hence I conclude, that *και ευαγγελιζομενου* should be thrown out as a marginal reading, founded perhaps on

²²⁹ Acts, xiv. 15. Gal. i. 23.

²³⁰ Rev. x. 7.

²³¹ Bowyer's Conjectures.

“Matth. iv. 23. or ix. 35.” Doubtless, according to the import of the English phrase, he always preached the Gospel when he taught, inasmuch as his teaching consisted either in explaining the doctrine, or enforcing the precepts of the Christian religion, which is all that we mean by *preaching the gospel*. But his teaching, though it was sometimes, was not always, (as is manifest from his whole history,) attended with the intimation above mentioned, which, in that history, is the only thing implied in *εὐαγγελίζομενου*. A close version of the words removes every difficulty. *One day, as he was teaching the people in the temple, and publishing the good tidings.* In my judgment, this last circumstance was the more worthy of being specified here by the Evangelist, as it has probably been that which then incensed the chief priests, and prompted them to demand of him in so peremptory a manner to show his warrant for what he did. To say that the reign of the Messiah was about to commence, would be accounted by them very presumptuous, and might be construed into an insinuation, that he himself was the Messiah, a position which we find them soon after pronouncing blasphemy: and in any case they would consider the declaration (which was well known not to originate from them) as an attempt to undermine their authority with the people.

Hence I also will take the liberty to conclude, that the common way of rendering the Greek verb, by the aid of consecrated words, not only into English, but into Latin, and most modern

languages, has produced an association in the minds of men strong enough to mislead critical, as well as ordinary readers; else men of letters, like Dr. Owen and Mr. Bowyer, had never fancied that there is here either a tautology, or so much as a redundancy of words. I further conclude, that if we were to proceed in the way proposed by the former of these critics, and to expunge whatever in Scripture we dislike, or imagine might be spared, it is impossible to say what would be left at last of the divine oracles. The remarker, if he would act consistently, ought also to throw out as a marginal reading *κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον*, which is coupled with *διδασκων* in the two places of Matthew referred to. We may not be able to discover the meaning or the use of a particular expression; for who can discover every thing? but let us not be vain enough to think, that what we do not discover, no other person ever will²³².

§ 15. THE only other word in the New Testament that can be said to be nearly synonymous with either of the preceding, is *καταγγελλω ανηuncio*, I announce, publish, or promulgate. It is an intermediate term between *κηρυσσω* and *ευαγγελιζομαι*. In regard to the manner, it implies more of public notice than is necessarily implied in *ευαγγελιζομαι*, but less than is denoted by *κηρυσσω*. In regard to the subject, though commonly used in a good sense, it does not express

²³² Diss. XII. Part II. § 13, 14.

quite so much as *εὐαγγελίζομαι*, but it expresses more than *κηρυσσω*, which generally refers to some one remarkable fact or event, that may be told in a sentence or two. Accordingly both these words, *καταγγελλω* and *εὐαγγελίζομαι* come nearer to a coincidence in signification with *διδασκω* than *κηρυσσω* does.

§ 16. THE word *εὐαγγελιστης*, rendered *evangelist*, occurs only thrice in the New Testament. First in the Acts²³³, where Philip, one of the seven deacons is called an evangelist; secondly, in the Epistle to the Ephesians²³⁴, where *evangelists* are mentioned after apostles and prophets, as one of the offices which our Lord, after his ascension, had appointed for the conversion of infidels, and the establishment of order in his church; and, lastly, in the injunction which Paul gives Timothy to do the work of an evangelist²³⁵. This word has also obtained another signification which, though not scriptural, is very ancient. As *εὐαγγελιον* sometimes denotes any of the four narratives of our Lord's life and suffering, which make a part of the canon, so *evangelist* means the composer. Hence Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are called evangelists.

§ 17. As to the word *διδασκειν*, it may suffice to observe, that it can hardly ever be wrong translated into Latin by the verb *docere*, or into English by the verb *to teach*; and that it was

²³³ Acts, xxi. 8.

²³⁴ Eph. iv. 11.

²³⁵ 2 Tim. iv. 5.

mentioned in the title, not on account of any difficulty occasioned by it, but solely for the sake of suggesting my purpose to show that, far from being coincident, it has not even so great an affinity in signification to the other words there mentioned, as is commonly supposed. But, as the supposed coincidence or affinity always arises from mistaking the exact import of the other words, and not from any error in regard to this, a particular explanation of this term is not necessary.

34
33

Feb 5, 1833.

Dissertation the Seventh.

INQUIRY INTO THE IMPORT OF CERTAIN TITLES OF HONOUR
OCCURRING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I INTEND, in this Dissertation, to offer a few remarks on those titles of honour which most frequently occur in the New Testament, that we may judge more accurately of their import, by attending, not only to their peculiarities in signification, but also to the difference in the ancient Jewish manner of applying them, from that which obtains among the modern Europeans, in the use of words thought to be equivalent.

PART I.

Kyrios.

NOTHING can be more evident, than that, originally, titles were every where the names, either of offices, or of relations, natural or conventional, in-somuch that it could not be said of any of them,

as may be said, with justice, of several of our titles at present, those especially called titles of quality, that they mark neither office nor relation, property nor jurisdiction, but merely certain degrees of hereditary honour, and rights of precedence. Relation implies opposite relation in the object. Now, when those persons, for whose behoof a particular office was exercised, and who were consequently in the opposite relation, were very numerous, as a whole nation, province, or kingdom, the language commonly had no correlate to the title expressing the office; that is, it had not a term appropriated to denote the people who stood in the opposite relation. But when there was only a small number, there was a special term for denoting the relative connection in which these also stood. Thus the terms, *king*, *judge*, *prophet*, *pontiff*, hardly admitted any correlative term, but the general one of *people*. But this does not hold invariably. With us the correlate to *king* is *subject*. In like manner, offices which are exercised, not statedly, in behalf of certain individuals, but variously and occasionally, in behalf sometimes of one, sometimes of another, do not often require titles correlative. Of this kind are the names of most handicrafts, and several other professions. Yet, with us the *physician* has his *patients*, the *lawyer* his *clients*, and the *tradesman* his *customers*. In most other cases of relation, whether arising from nature, or from convention, we find title tallying with title exactly. Thus, *father* has *son*, *husband* has *wife*, *uncle* has

nephew, teacher has *disciple* or *scholar*, *master* has *servant*.

§ 2. I ADMIT, however, that in the most simple times, and the most ancient usages with which we are acquainted, things did not remain so entirely on the original footing, as that none should be called *father*, but by his *son* or his *daughter*; none should be saluted *master*, but by his *servant*; or styled *teacher*, but by his *scholar*. There is a progression in every thing relating to language, as, indeed, in all human sciences and arts. Necessity, first, and ornament, afterwards, lead to the extension of words beyond their primitive signification. All languages are scanty in the beginning, not having been fabricated beforehand, to suit the occasions which might arise. Now, when a person, in speaking, is sensible of the want of a proper sign for expressing his thought, he, much more naturally, recurs to a word which is the known name of something that has an affinity to what he means, than to a sound which, being entirely new to the hearers, cannot, by any law of association in our ideas, suggest his meaning to them. Whereas, by availing himself of the name of something related, by resemblance, or otherwise, to the sentiment he wants to convey, he touches some principle, in the minds of those whom he addresses, which (if they be persons of any sagacity) will quickly lead them to the discovery of his meaning. Thus, for expressing the reverence which I feel for a respectable character,

in one who is also my senior, I shall naturally be led to style him *father*, though I be not literally his *son*; to express my submission to a man of greater merit and dignity, I shall call him *master*, though I be not his *servant*; and to express my respect for one of more extensive knowledge and erudition, I shall denominate him *teacher*, though I be not his *disciple*. Indeed, these consequences arise so directly from those essential principles of the imagination, uniformly to be found in human nature, that deviations, in some degree similar, from the earliest meanings of words, are to be found in all tongues, ancient and modern. This is the first step from pure simplicity.

§ 3. YET, that the differences in laws, sentiments, and manners, which obtain in different nations, will occasion in this, as well as in other things, considerable variety, is not to be denied. In Asia, a common sign of respect to superiors was prostration. In Europe, that ceremony was held in abhorrence. What I have remarked above, suits entirely the progress of civilization in the Asiatic regions. The high-spirited republicans of Greece and Rome, appear, on the contrary, long to have considered the title *kyrios*, or *dominus*, given to a man, as proper only in the mouth of a slave. Octavius, the emperor, when master of the world, and absolute in Rome, seems not to have thought it prudent to accept it. He very justly marked the precise import of the term, according to the usage which then obtained, in that noted saying ascribed to him. *Imperator*

militum, Princeps reipublicæ, Dominus servorum. To assume this title, therefore, he considered as what could not fail to be interpreted by his people, as an indirect, yet sufficiently evident, manner of calling them his *slaves*; for such was then the common import of the word *servus*. But, in despotic countries, and countries long accustomed to kingly government, it did not hurt the delicacy of the greatest subject to give the title *Dominus* to the prince.

§ 4. THAT such honorary applications of words were quite common among the Jews, was evident to every body, who has read the Bible with attention. In such applications, however, it must be noted, that the titles are not considered as strictly due from those who give them. They are considered rather as voluntary expressions of respect, in him who gives the title, being a sort of tribute, either to civility, or to the personal merit of him on whom it is bestowed. But, to affix titles to places and offices, to be given by all who shall address those possessed of such places and offices, whether they that give them stand in the relation correspondent to the title or not, or whether they possess the respect or esteem implied or not, is comparatively a modern refinement in the civil intercourse of mankind, at least in the degree to which it is carried in Europe. This is the second remove from the earliest and simplest state of society.

§ 5. THERE remains a third, still more remarkable, to which I find nothing similar in ancient

times. We have gotten a number of honorary titles, such as *duke*, *marquis*, *earl*, *viscount*, *baron*, *baronet*, &c. which it would be very difficult, or rather impossible to define; as they express, at present, neither office, nor relation, but which, nevertheless, descend from father to son, are regarded as part of a man's inheritance, and, without any consideration of merit, or station, or wealth, secure to him certain titular honours and ceremonial respect, and which are of a more unalienable nature than any other property (if they may be called property,) real or personal, that he possesses. I am sensible, that those modern titles were all originally names of offices, as well as the ancient. Thus, *duke* was equivalent to commander; *marquis*, or margrave (for they differed in different countries,) to guardian of the marches; *count*, landgrave, alderman, or *earl*, to sheriff; whence the shire is still denominated county; *viscount*, to deputy-sheriff. *Vicecomes*, accordingly, is the Latin word in law-writs for the officiating sheriff¹. When the principal, in any kind of office, becomes too rich, and too lazy, for the service, the burden naturally devolves upon the substitute; and the power of the constituent, through disuse, comes at last to be antiquated. But, so much was the title once connected with the office, that when the king intended to create a new *earl*, he had no other expedient, than to erect a certain territory into

¹ Blackstone's Commentary, Introduc. Sect. 4. and B. I. ch. xii. § 3, 4.

a *county*, *earldom*, or *sheriffdom*, (for these words were then synonymous,) and to bestow the jurisdiction of it on the person honoured with the title. The *baron*, though his name was anciently common to all the nobility, was judge or lord of a smaller and subordinate jurisdiction, called a *barony*². In process of time, through the vicissitudes that necessarily happen in the manners of the people, and in their methods of government, the offices came gradually to be superseded, or at least to subsist no longer, on the same footing of hereditary possession. But, when these had given place to other political arrangements, the titles, as a badge of ancestry, and of the right to certain privileges which accompanied the name, were, as we may naturally suppose, still suffered to remain. It hardly now answers the first end, as a badge of ancestry, in those countries where there are often new creations: but it answers the second, and besides, ennobles their posterity. In consequence of these differences, the titles are regarded as due to him who succeeds to them, alike from all men, and that without any consideration of either personal or official dignity, or even of territorial possessions. Thus, one who is entitled to be called *my lord* is, in this manner, addressed not only by his inferiors, but by his equals, nay, even superiors. The king himself, in addressing his nobles, says *My Lords*.

² See Spelman's Glossary on the different names.

§ 6. IT was totally different among the Hebrews, I might have said, among the ancients in general. The Greek word *κυριος kyrios*, answering to the Hebrew אָדוֹן *adon*, to the Latin *dominus*, and to the words *lord* or *master* in English, was not originally given, unless by a servant to his master, by a subject to his sovereign, or in brief, by one bound to obey, to the person entitled to command. Soon, however, it became common to give it to a superior, though the person who gave it, had no dependence upon him; and if sometimes it was, through complaisance, bestowed on an equal; still the man who gave the title, was considered as modestly putting himself on the footing of an inferior and servant, inasmuch as the title was invariably understood to express, not only superior rank, but even authority, in the person on whom it was conferred, over him who gave it. We have examples in Scripture which put it beyond a doubt, that for any man to address another by the title *my lord*, and to acknowledge himself that person's servant, were but different ways of expressing the same thing, *κυριος* and *δουλος* being correlative terms. The courteous form of addressing with them, when they meant to be respectful (for it was not used on all occasions,) was not that of most modern Europeans, who, in using the second personal pronoun, employ the plural for the singular; nor that of the Germans, who change both person and number, making the third plural serve for the second singular, but it was what more rarely could occasion

ambiguity than either of these; the substitution of the third person for the first, the number being retained, whether singular or plural. This mode, as occurring in Scripture, gives an additional illustration of the import of the term *κύριος* with them. "Let *thy servant*, I pray thee," said Judah³ to his brother Joseph, when governor of Egypt, "speak a word in *my lord's* ears." "Nay, *my lord*," said the Shunamite to the Prophet Elisha, "do not deceive *thine handmaid*⁴." Some other instances are marked in the margin⁵.

Assisted by these remarks, we may perceive the force of that observation of the Apostle Peter⁶, in regard to the conjugal respect and obedience yielded by Sarah to her husband Abraham. *Being in subjection*, says he, speaking of the wives, *to their own husbands, even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord*; that is, acknowledging, by this her usual compellation, her inferiority, and obligation to obedience; for the intimacy of their relation hinders us from ascribing it to a ceremonious civility. Some have cavilled at this argument brought by the Apostle. The rank and quality of Abraham, say they, who, by the accounts we have of him, was a powerful prince, entitled him to be addressed in this manner by every body. Others, in the opposite extreme, have inferred that every dutiful wife ought to give the same testimony of respect and submission to her husband, which this pious matron did to the

³ Gen. xlv. 18. ⁴ 2 Kings, iv. 16. ⁵ Gen. xxxii. 4, 5.
xxxiii. 5. 8. xlii. 10. 1 Kings, xviii. 7. 9. ⁶ 1 Pet. iii. 5, 6.

Patriarch. Both ways of reasoning are weak, and proceed from the same ignorance of the different import of words, resulting from the difference of manners and customs. The title *lord* with us, as applied to men, is either hereditary in certain families, or annexed by royal authority, or immemorial usage, to certain offices and stations. Wherever it is considered as due, nobody, of what rank soever, withholds it. And wherever it is not due, one would not only expose one's self to ridicule by giving it, but, instead of paying a compliment to the person addressed, would put him out of countenance. It cannot, therefore, with us, serve as a token of subjection in the person who gives it. Such is the consequence of the different footing whereon things now stand, that the titles which, in those times of simplicity, were merely relative and ambulatory, are now absolute and stationary. Whereas the man who, in those ages, was well entitled to the compellation of *lord* in one company, had no title to it at all in another. It happens with us frequently (to wit, as often as two or more who, by law or custom, have a right to that mark of respect, converse together,) that the title of *lord* is reciprocally given and taken by the same persons. But of this I do not recollect a single instance in Scripture. Such a thing to the ancients must, doubtless, have appeared ridiculous, as an acknowledgment of superiority in the person on whom it was conferred, was always understood to be conveyed by it. For, though it was sometimes, as I

observed, politely given to an equal, he was thereby treated as superior : and, as each could not be superior, to retort the title on him who gave it, must have been considered by them, as an indelicate rejection of the civility offered. To their sentiments it seems to have been more conformable, that the honour should be repaid with some other marks of respect or affection, by the person who received it. The fact, if I remember right, is certain : this manner of accounting for it, I acknowledge to be no more than conjecture ; but it is a conjecture which some passages in ancient history, particularly the conversation of Abraham with Ephron and the sons of Heth⁷, and Jacob's interview with his elder brother Esau⁸, after an absence of more than fourteen years, render not improbable.

§ 7. THE title of *master* (for the Hebrew *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*, signify no more) was perhaps universally the first which, by a kind of catachresis, was bestowed on a superior, or a person considered as such, by one who was not his servant or dependent. But still, as it implied the acknowledgment of superiority, it varied with the company. There were few so low who were not entitled to this honourable compellation from some persons ; there were none (the king alone excepted) so high as to be entitled to it from every person. Joab, who was captain-general of the army, is properly styled by Uriah⁹, who was only

⁷ Gen. xxiii. 3, &c. ⁸ xxxiii. 1.—15. ⁹ 2 Sam. xi. 11.

an inferior officer, *my lord* Joab ; but had the king himself, or any of the princes, given him that title, it could have been understood no otherwise than in derision. It would have been, as if the sovereign should call any of his ministers his master. The title *father*, though held in general superior to *lord*, yet, as the respect expressed by it, implied superiority, not in station, but in years, experience, and knowledge, was sometimes given to the Prophets of the true God, even by kings. Thus, the Prophet Elisha is in this manner addressed by the king of Israel¹⁰ ; but no prophet is ever denominated lord or master by one vested with the supreme authority. By others the prophets were often so denominated. Thus Obadiah, who was steward of the king's household, calls the Prophet Elijah, *my lord* Elijah¹¹. The same title we find also given to Elisha¹². Whereas to the king himself, the common address, from men of all ranks, was, *my lord*, *O king*, or, as the expression strictly implied, *O king, my master* ; but by the king, the title *my lord*, or *my master*, was given to none but God. The reason is obvious. A monarch, who was not tributary, acknowledged, in point of station, no earthly superior. And though, in any rank inferior to the highest, good breeding might require it to be conferred on an equal, the royal dignity appears generally to have been considered as of too delicate a nature to admit the use of such compliments without derogation. Cræsus king of

¹⁰ 2 Kings, vi. 21.

¹¹ 1 Kings, xviii. 7. 13.

¹² 2 Kings, ii. 19. iv. 16. 28.

Lydia, is represented by Herodotus¹³, as giving the title *δεσποτης*, which is of the same import, to Cyrus king of Persia; but it was after his kingdom was conquered by Cyrus, and when he himself was his captive, and consequently, according to the usages of those times, his slave. Before that event he would have disdained to salute any man with this compellation. Ahab king of Israel, styled Benhadad king of Syria, *my lord*; but it was when, through fear, he consented to surrender himself and all that he had, into his hands¹⁴.

I am not, however, certain that the politeness of the Orientals, which, in the judgment of the Greeks, savoured of servility, did not sometimes carry them thus far: for, though no such title is found in the conversation between Solomon and the queen of Sheba¹⁵, or between Jehoshaphat king of Judah, and Ahab king of Israel¹⁶, as related either in the First Book of Kings, or in the Second Book of Chronicles; or in the correspondence between Hiram king of Tyre and Solomon, as related in the First Book of Kings¹⁷; yet, in the account we have of this correspondence in the Second Book of Chronicles¹⁸, which is of much later date, Hiram is represented as giving this title to both David and Solomon. Whether this ought to be considered, as merely a strain of eastern complaisance, or as an acknow-

¹³ Lib. I.¹⁴ 1 Kings, xx. 4.¹⁵ 1 Kings, x.¹⁶ 1 Kings, xxii. 2 Chron. xviii.¹⁷ 1 Kings, ix. 10, &c.¹⁸ 2 Chron. ii. 14, 15.

ledgment of subordination, a state to which many of the neighbouring princes had been reduced by those monarchs, I will not take upon me to say. But it may hold as a general truth, that when this title is found given to a man in any ancient author, particularly in Scripture, before we can judge from it of the quality of the person accosted, we must know something of the quality of the person that accosts. It is not so with us, or in any Christian European country at present. When we find one addressed with the title of *highness*, or *grace*, or *lordship*, we discover his rank, without needing to know any thing of the addresser, save only, that he is not ignorant of the current forms of civility.

When we find that Mary Magdalene addresses, with the title of lord (*κυριε* is her word¹⁹), one whom she took to be no higher than a gardener, we are apt to accuse her, in our hearts, either of flattery or of gross ignorance, to accost a man in so low a station with so high a title. But the ignorance is entirely our own, when we would vainly make our ideas, modes, and usages, a standard for other ages and nations. Mary and a gardener might, in the world's account, have been on a level in point of rank. If so, as he was a stranger to her, modesty and the laws of courtesy led her to yield to him the superiority, by giving him this respectful title. Abraham's servant was addressed in the same way by Rebekah,

¹⁹ John, xx. 15.

before she knew him²⁰. Paul and Silas, who cannot be supposed superior in figure and appearance to ordinary mechanics, were, after having been publicly stripped, beaten, imprisoned, and put in the stocks, accosted with the title *κυριοι lords*²¹, though the common translation has it *sirs*. But it was given by a jailor, and, it may be added, after a miraculous interposition of heaven in their favour. To satisfy us, however, that this last circumstance was not necessary to entitle mean people to be addressed in this manner by those, whose condition was equally mean or meaner; we may observe that the same title *κυριε* is given to Philip²², one of the Apostles from Bethsaida of Galilee, who was probably not above the rank of a fisherman. The persons who gave it were Greeks, doubtless of the lowest sort, who had come to Jerusalem to worship. With us the title *lord*, given to one who by law or custom has no right to it, is a sort of injury to the whole order to whom the constitution of their country has given an exclusive privilege to be so denominated. With them it could affect no third person whatever, as it implied merely that the person spoken to was, by the speaker, acknowledged his superior.

It may appear to some an objection against this account of the relative import of the words *adon* and *kyrios*, that in the English Bible, we find the title *lord*, in one place of the sacred history, used

²⁰ Gen. xxiy. 13.²¹ Acts, xvi. 30.²² John, xii. 21.

as we should use the word *nobleman* or *grandee*, for denoting a person of a certain determinate rank. Thus we are informed of a *lord*, on whose hand king Jehoram leaned, who is mentioned thrice under this description in the same chapter²³. I acknowledge that, if the Hebrew word there were *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*, it would suffice to overturn what has been here advanced in regard to the difference between the ancient use of such titles and the modern. But it is not *adon* and *kyrios*. In neither language is it a title of honour, but a mere name of office. In Hebrew it is שָׁלִישׁ *shalish*, in Greek τριστατης *tristatees*, a word which occurs often in other places, and is never translated *lord*, but always *captain*, as it ought to have been rendered here. The Vulgate interprets it, not *dominus quidam*, but very properly *unus de ducibus*. Again, in the common version, we find mention of the *king and his lords*²⁴, precisely in the manner wherein an English historian would speak of his sovereign and the peers of the realm. But neither here is the Hebrew word *adon*, nor the Greek *kyrios*. It is שָׂרָיו *sharaio*, in the former, and οἱ ἀρχοντες αὐτοῦ in the latter. In the Vulgate it is rendered *principes ejus*, and ought to have been in English *his chief men*, or *his principal officers*. Whereas אֲדֹנָיו *adonaio* in Hebrew, οἱ κυριοι αὐτοῦ in Greek, and *domini ejus* in Latin, would have meant *his masters*, or those whom he served, a sense quite foreign from the purpose. But though our word

²³ 2 Kings, vii. 2. 17. 19.

²⁴ Ezra, viii. 25.

lords, used as in the above quotations, is not unsuitable to the English style; it would have been better, in such instances, to conform to the Hebrew idiom, for a reason which will appear from the next paragraph. Herod is said, by our translators, to have made a supper to his *lords*²⁵. The word is *μεγιστασιν* *grandees*. I shall only add, that the term *lords* is also used in the English translation, where the corresponding words, both in Hebrew and in Greek, are names of offices equivalent to rulers, magistrates, governors of provinces. And therefore nothing can be concluded from the application of this title in the version.

§ 8. Now, with the aid of the above observations on the relative value of honorary titles among the ancients, we may discover the full force of our Saviour's argument, in regard to the dignity of the Messiah. The modern use in this particular, is so different from the ancient, that, without knowing this circumstance, and reflecting upon it, a proper apprehension of the reasoning is unattainable. I shall give the whole passage as rendered in this version²⁶. *While so many Pharisees were present, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of the Messiah? Whose son should he be? They answered, David's. He replied, How then doth David, speaking by inspiration, call him his Lord? The Lord, saith he, said to my Lord, sit at my right hand, until I make thy foes*

²⁵ Mark, vi. 21.

²⁶ Matth., xxii. 41, &c.

thy footstool. If the Messiah were David's Son, would David call him his Lord? To this none of them could answer. They were confounded; yet from our very different usages, whereby such titles, if due at all, are due alike from superiors as from inferiors and equals; we cannot easily, at first, feel the strength of this argument. I have observed already, that an independent monarch, such as David, acknowledged no lord or master but God. Far less would he bestow this title on a son or descendant. It was customary, because respectful, and in the natural order of subordination, for a son so to address his father. Accordingly, in the parable of the man who had two sons, the elder son is thus represented as answering his father, *Εγω κυριε*²⁷. It is the same word which is commonly rendered *lord*, but in this place *sir*. The same title was also given by Rachel to her father Laban, when he came into her tent, in quest of his images²⁸, and even by Jacob, after his return from Padan Aram, to his elder brother Esau²⁹. In no instance, however, will it be found given by a father to his son. This, according to their notions of paternal dignity and authority, which were incomparably higher than ours, would have been preposterous. The Pharisees, and other hearers, were so sensible of this that, however much they showed themselves, on most occasions, disposed to cavil, our Saviour's observation struck them dumb. *None of them could answer.*

²⁷ Matth. xxi. 30.²⁸ Gen. xxxi. 35.²⁹ Gen. xxxii. 4, 5.

§ 9. THOUGH the general belief of the Jews at that time was, that the Messiah would be a much greater man than David, a mighty conqueror, and even a universal monarch, the sovereign of the kings of the earth, who was to subdue all nations, and render them tributary to the chosen people; yet they still supposed him to be a mere man, possessed of no higher nature than that which he derived from his earthly progenitors. Though their Rabbies at that time agreed that the words quoted were spoken of the Messiah, and spoken by David, the difficulty suggested by our Lord seems never to have occurred to them; and now that it was pointed out, they appeared, by their silence, to admit that, on the received hypothesis, it was incapable of a solution. It was plainly our Saviour's intention to insinuate, that there was, in this character, as delineated by the Prophets, and suggested by the Royal Psalmist, something superior to human, which they were not aware of. And, though he does not, in express words, give the solution, he leaves no person who reflects, at a loss to infer it. I have been the more particular in this illustration, in order to shew of how much importance it is, for attaining a critical acquaintance with the import of words in the sacred languages, to become acquainted with the customs, sentiments, and manners of the people.

§ 10. THE name *κύριος*, in the New Testament, is most frequently translated, in the common version, *lord*, sometimes *sir*, sometimes *master*, and

once *owner*. It corresponds pretty nearly, except when it is employed in translating the name *Jehovah*, to the Latin *dominus*, and to the Italian *signore*. But there is not any one word, either in French or in English, that will so generally answer. It may occasionally be applied to a man in any station, except the very lowest, because, to men of every other station there are inferiors. It is always proper, as applied to God, to whom every creature is inferior. In the former of these applications, namely to man, it frequently corresponds, but not invariably, to the French *monsieur*, and to the English *sir*, or *master*. In the application to God, it answers always to the French *seigneur*, and to the English *lord*. There is a necessity, in these two languages, of changing the term, in compliance with the idiom of the tongue. *Domine* in Latin, and *signor* in Italian, in like manner as *kyrie* in Greek, and *adoni* in Hebrew, are equally suitable, in addressing God or man. But every body must be sensible, that this cannot be affirmed of the compellation of *monsieur* in French, or *sir* in English.

§ 11. THERE is something so peculiar in the English use of these familiar titles that it may be proper to take particular notice of it, before I proceed to the application of them in translating. In regard to the term *sir*, the most common of all, let it be observed, first, that, in its ordinary acceptation, it is never used, except in the vocative answering to *kyrie* and *domine*; secondly, that it

is never joined to the name of a person, neither to the Christian name, nor to the surname. When the proper name is used, *master*, not *sir*, must be prefixed. I say this of the word *sir*, in its ordinary acceptance; for when it serves as the distinguishing title of knighthood, it is used in all the cases, and is always prefixed to the Christian name. But for this application there is no occasion in translating. The third thing I shall observe, on the ordinary acceptance of the word, is, that it never admits the article, either definite or indefinite. This, indeed, is a consequence of its use being confined to the vocative. Lastly, it has not a proper plural. The word *sirs*, originally the plural, and equally respectful with the singular, is now rarely used. When it is used, it is with some difference in meaning. The compellation *sir*, almost always shows respect; but *sirs* shows a degree of familiarity hardly consistent with respect. It is most commonly employed in speaking to a crowd, or to inferiors. We usually supply the plural of *sir*, in our addresses to others, by the word *gentlemen*. But this bears so strong a signature of the distinctions which obtain in modern Europe, that it could not be used with propriety in the translation of an ancient author.

Now, as to the title of *lord*, I have several peculiarities to observe. In the first place, when in the vocative, without either the possessive pronoun *my* prefixed, or any name or title annexed, the application is invariably, according to the best use at present, to God or Christ. When it is ad-

dressed to men (now it is only to noblemen, and to persons in certain eminent stations that use permits us to give it,) it is always either preceded by the pronoun *my*, or followed by the title, or both. Thus, to say, *Lord*, or, *O Lord, help me!* is nowhere proper but in an address to God: whereas, *Help me, my lord*, is proper only when spoken to a man. The distinction now taken notice of, is, if I mistake not, sacredly observed in the common version of the Old Testament. There are two cases, indeed, in which *my Lord*, in the vocative, is applied to God; but the intention, in both, is sufficiently marked. In one case, whereof there occur a few examples, it is preceded by the interjection *O!* which adds solemnity to the invocation: *O! my Lord*³⁰. The other is, when it is coupled with *my God*, as in this³¹, *Awake to my judgment, my God, and my Lord*. Another thing to be remarked is, that when the term *lord* has the definite article prefixed, with no name, title, or description subjoined, it is to be understood as spoken of God, or of Christ. When the word is applied to men, whether the article be, or be not, used, the name or title should be annexed. If the frequent recurrence of the title render it proper to omit it, we must say, *my lord*, not *the lord*, acted thus; or we may say, *his lordship*, this last form being never used of a celestial superior.

§ 12. So much for the words *sir* and *lord*, as used by us at present. In regard to the term

³⁰ Exod. iv. 10. 13.

³¹ Psalm. xxxv. 23.

master, there can be no question that it comes nearer the primitive signification of *κυριος*, than either of the former. *Κυριος* and *δουλος* are correlates in Greek, just as *master* and *servant* are in English. Indeed, *lord* and *servant* are thus used in the common version of the Gospels, but not so properly. *Vassal*, not *servant*, is, in English, correlative to *lord*³². At least, it was so anciently; for both were feudal terms, the latter denoting the proprietor of the land, the former the tenant, or him who held it under the proprietor. But, with the gradual abolition of feudal customs, the name *vassal* has gone almost into disuse; whereas the import of the term *lord* has been greatly altered, in some respects extended, and in some respects limited. But such variations are incident to every language. A remain of this usage, however, we have still in Scotland, in the meaning assigned to the word *laird*, which is no other than the old Scotch pronunciation of *lord*. In that dialect, it invariably denotes *landlord*, or, as Dr. Johnson well explains it, *lord of the manor*. But to return: the reason why our translators have chosen sometimes to contrast *servant* and *lord*, rather than *servant* and *master*, is because they had preoccupied the word *master*, employing it to answer to *διδασκαλος*. This made it necessary to recur to some other term, to answer to *κυριος*, for which none fitter could be found than *lord*. I have thought it preferable to render

³² Blackstone's Com. B. II. ch. 4.

διδασκαλος, more literally, *teacher*, and say ³³, *The disciple is not above his teacher, nor the servant above his master*. That the motive of our translators was precisely what I have mentioned, is evident from this, that in the numerous passages in the Epistles, where the observance of the relative duties of masters and servants is inculcated, the word κυριος, as well as δεσποτης, is always rendered *master*, and not *lord*. But there is an ambiguity, which arises from rendering διδασκαλος *master*, when the context does not point out what kind of master is meant. In the words of James ³⁴, Μη πολλοι διδασκαλοι γινεσθε, as expressed in the common translation, *Be not many masters*, hardly any of the unlearned suppose him to be speaking of *teachers*.

§ 13. Now, let us consider the ordinary method which our translators have followed, in the history of Jesus Christ. One who reads the Bible with reflection, (which not one of a thousand does,) is astonished to find, that on the very first appearance of Jesus Christ, as a teacher, though attended with no exterior marks of splendor and majesty; though not acknowledged by the great and learned of the age; though meanly habited, in a garb not superior to that of an ordinary artificer, in which capacity we have ground to believe he assisted ³⁵ his supposed father, in his earlier days; he is addressed by almost every body

³³ Matth. x. 24.³⁴ James, iii. 1.³⁵ Mark, vi. 3

in the peculiar manner in which the Almighty is addressed in prayer. Thus the leper³⁶, *Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.* Thus the centurion³⁷, *Lord my servant lieth at home.* The Canaanitish woman crieth after him³⁸, *Have mercy on me, O Lord.* He is likewise mentioned sometimes under the single appellation of *The Lord*³⁹, without any addition, a form of expression which, in the Old Testament, our translators, as above observed, had invariably appropriated to God. What is the meaning of this? Is it that, from his first showing himself in public, all men believed him to be the Messiah, and not only so, but to be possessed of a divine nature, and entitled to be accosted as God? Far from it. The utmost that can with truth be affirmed of the multitude, is that they believed him to be a prophet. And even those who, in process of time, came to think him the Messiah, never formed a conception of any character, as belonging to that title, superior to that of an earthly sovereign, or of any nature superior to the human. Nay, that the Apostles themselves, before his resurrection, had no higher notion, it were easy to prove. What then is the reason of this strange peculiarity? Does the original give any handle for it? None in the least. For, though the title that is given to him, is the same that is given to God, it is so far from being peculiarly so, as is the case with the Eng-

³⁶ Matth. viii. 2.

³⁸ Matth. xv. 22.

³⁷ 6.

³⁹ John, xx. 2.

lish term so circumstanced, that it is the common compellation of civility given not only to every stranger, but to almost every man of a decent appearance, by those whose station does not place them in an evident superiority.

It is the title with which Mary Magdalene accosted one whom she supposed to be a gardener⁴⁰. It is the title given by some Greek proselytes to the Apostle Philip⁴¹, probably a fisherman of Galilee. It is the title with which Paul the tent-maker, and Silas his companion, were saluted by the jailor at Philippi⁴². Lastly, it is the title with which Pontius Pilate, the Roman procurator, a pagan and idolater, is addressed by the chief priests and Pharisees⁴³. And though the Jewish rulers would not refuse what was merely respectful to the Roman procurator, who as such was their superior, we may be sure they would not have given him a title that could be understood to imply any thing sacred or divine. Our translators have been so sensible of this, that even in the application to the chief magistrate within the country, they have thought fit to render it only *sir*. Further, it is the title which those gave to Jesus, who, at the time they gave it, knew nothing about him. In this manner, the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well addressed him⁴⁴, when she knew no more of him than that he was a Jew, which

⁴⁰ John, xx. 15.

⁴¹ John, xii. 21.

⁴² Acts, xvi. 30. See § 7.

⁴³ Matth. xxvii. 63

⁴⁴ John, iv. 11.

would not recommend him to her regard. Thus also he was addressed by the impotent man who lay near the pool of Bethesda⁴⁵, who, as we learn from the sequel of the story, did not then know the person who conversed with him, and who soon proved his benefactor. In these places indeed, and some others which might be mentioned, our translators have rendered the word *κύριε*, not *lord*, but *sir*. Why they have not uniformly done so, when the term is given by contemporaries to Jesus residing on the earth, it would be impossible to assign a good reason. The only reason I can imagine, is the uniform practice that obtains very properly amongst his followers since his ascension, now when all power in heaven and on earth is committed to him⁴⁶, now when he is made head over all things unto his church⁴⁷, and hath received a name that is above every name⁴⁸, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on the earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is **LORD**, to the glory of God the Father: in one word, now when men are more especially obliged to honour the Son even as they honour the Father⁴⁹.

Is there any fitness in thus exhibiting the honours of deity, as appropriated to him in the very time of his humiliation, when, for our sakes, he was pleased to veil his glory⁵⁰, when he made

⁴⁵ John, v. 7.

⁴⁶ Matth. xxviii. 18.

⁴⁷ Eph. i. 22.

⁴⁸ Phil. ii. 9, &c

⁴⁹ John, v. 23.

⁵⁰ Phil. ii. 6.

himself of no reputation, divested himself, as the expression strictly implies, and took upon him the form of a servant? Or is there any consistency in representing men as using this style, whose sentiments, on examination, will not support it? The highest to which the faith of any of the people; not his disciples, at that time rose, was to think that he was⁵¹ John the Baptist risen from the dead, Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets. But where do we find any of the Prophets addressed with that peculiarity of idiom, which commonly distinguishes the Deity? There is, therefore, in this manner of translating, a very great impropriety, first, as it produces an inconsistency between the style of the persons introduced, and what from the history itself we discover of their sentiments; secondly, as it thereby, to a mere English reader, throws a degree of incredibility on the whole narrative.

§ 14. If they had uniformly translated the word *κυριε lord*, to whomsoever applied, they would have done better; because every reader of common sense must have perceived that the word was employed, not according to the English idiom, but according to the usage of a tongue very different. Still, however, by comparing the various places where it occurs, it would have been practicable to reduce the term to its proper value. Not that I approve this servile manner of translating, any more than that in the opposite extreme called liberal. To translate the words, but not

⁵¹ Matth. xvi. 13, &c.

the idiom, is doing but half, and much the easier half, of the work of a translator, and never fails to render obscure and enigmatical in the translation, what is perspicuous and simple in the original. But our interpreters have, in this particular, followed neither the Hebrew idiom nor the English, but adopted a peculiarity in regard to Jesus Christ, which represents most of his contemporaries, as entertaining the same opinions concerning him, which are now entertained among Christians. Now, nothing can be more manifest than that, in those days, the ideas of his Apostles themselves were far inferior to what we entertain.

To do justice, therefore, to our idiom, to preserve at once consistency, perspicuity, and propriety, it is necessary that the word *κύριος*, in an address to heaven, be rendered *Lord*, or *O Lord*; when the Supreme Being is not addressed, but spoken of, *the Lord*; in addressing a king, or eminent magistrate, *my lord*; and in other ordinary cases, *sir*. Sometimes from a servant to his master, or from one in immediate subordination, to a person on whom he depends, it may be more emphatical to say *master*. Let it, however, be observed, that in translating the Scripture, *κύριος* prefixed to a proper name, cannot be rendered either *sir* or *master*, immediately followed by the name, on account of the particular idea which that mode of expression conveys to us. Let it be also observed, that what I have said of *kyrios*, as applied to Jesus Christ, regards purely its application in the Gospels. It is plain, that after

Christ's ascension into heaven, and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, he is viewed in a very different light. Addresses to him are conveyed only by prayer, and ought to be clothed in its language. When we speak of him, it ought to be, not as of *a lord*, one possessed of great power and eminence, but as of *The Lord* of the creation, the heir of all things, to whom all authority in heaven and upon the earth, and all judgment are committed by the Father. That expression of Thomas, therefore, *ὁ Κυριος μου και ὁ Θεος μου*⁵², cannot be otherwise rendered than it has been rendered by our translators, *My Lord and my God*. It is manifest, from the exclamation, that Thomas viewed his Master now since his resurrection, though not yet ascended, in a light in which he had never viewed him before. For these reasons, I think that in general no alteration would be proper in the way of rendering the word *κυριος* as applied to Jesus, either in the Acts or in the Epistles. The case is different in the Gospels.

§ 15. It is proper to take notice, before I conclude this article, that the word *κυριος* is in the Septuagint also employed in translating the Hebrew word ~~יהוה~~ *Jehovah*, the incommunicable name of God. Though this is a proper name, and not an appellative, the Seventy, probably from the superstitious opinion which had arisen among the Jews (for it was evidently not from the begin-

⁵² John, xx. 28.

ning,) that it was dangerous to pronounce that word, and consequently to adopt it into another language, have thought fit to render it always *κύριος*, an appellative which, as we have seen, is of very extensive application. Nay, in reading the Hebrew Scriptures in the synagogue service, their doctors to this day always read *adon*, or *adoni*, *Lord* or *my Lord*, where they find *Jehovah*. The writers of the New Testament, who wrote in Greek, have so far conformed to the usage of their countrymen, that they have never introduced this name in their writings. In quoting from the Old Testament, they have adopted the method of the Seventy, whose words they frequently use. The generality of Christian translators have in this imitated their practice. Our own, in particular, have only in four places of the Old Testament, used the name *Jehovah*. In all other places, which are almost innumerable, they render it *the Lord*. But, for distinction's sake, when this word corresponds to *Jehovah*, it is printed in capitals.

I once thought, that in translating the New Testament, the word *Jehovah* might properly be replaced, wherever, in a quotation from the Old, that name was used in the Hebrew. On more mature reflection I now think differently. It seemed good to infinite wisdom, in the old dispensation, when a peculiar nation was chosen, and contradistinguished to all others, so far to condescend to the weakness of his creatures, as to distinguish himself as their God, by an appropriated name, which might discriminate him, with them, from the gods of the nations; the general names

God and *Lord* being applied to them all. But, in the Gospel dispensation, wherein all such distinctions were to be abolished, it was proper that there should remain nothing which might appear to represent God as a national or local deity. A proper name is not necessary where there are no more than one of a kind. We are not sensible of the want of a proper name for the sun, the moon, or the earth. It is not suitable in the interpreter of the New Testament, to show a greater nicety of distinction than the sacred penmen have warranted. It belongs rather to the annotator, than to the translator, to mark such differences. In translating the Old Testament, the distinction, in my judgment, ought to be sacredly preserved, for the very same reason that no distinction ought to be made, in the New. The translator ought faithfully to represent his original, as far as the language which he writes is capable of doing it. So much for the import of the word *κύριος*, and the different senses that it bears according to the application.

PART II.

Διδασκαλος, RABBI.

I PURPOSE NOW to make a few observations on the word *διδασκαλος*, and some other titles of respect current in Judea in the days of our Saviour. After the Babylonish captivity, when Jerusalem and the temple were rebuilt, and the people restored to their ancient possessions, care was taken, under the conduct of Ezra, and of those who succeeded him in the administration of affairs, to prevent their relapsing into idolatry, which had brought such accumulated calamities on their country. It was justly considered as one of the best expedients for answering this end, as we learn partly from Scripture, and partly from Jewish writers, to promote, amongst all ranks, the knowledge of God and of his law, and to excite the whole people, throughout the land, to join regularly in the public worship of the only true God. For their accommodation, synagogues came, in process of time, to be erected in every city and village where a sufficient number of people could be found to make a congregation. Every synagogue had its stated governors and president, that the public service might be decently con-

ducted, and that the people might be instructed in the sacred writings, both the law and the prophets. The synagogues were fitted for answering, among them, the like purposes with parish-churches, amongst us Christians. But this was not all. That the synagogues might be provided with knowing pastors and wise rulers, it was necessary that there should also be public seminaries or schools, wherein those who were destined to teach others, were to be taught themselves. And so great was their veneration for these schools or colleges, that they accounted them, says Buxtorf⁵³, more sacred than even synagogues, and next, in this respect, to the temple. They maintained that a synagogue might lawfully be converted into a school, but not a school into a synagogue. The former was ascending, the latter descending. Both were devoted to the service of God; but the synagogue, say they, is for the spiritual nourishment of the sheep, the school for that of the shepherds.

§ 2. Now their schools were properly what we should call divinity colleges; for in them they were instructed in the sacred language, the ancient Hebrew, not then the language of the country, in the law and the traditions, the writings of the Prophets, the holy ceremonies, the statutes, customs, and procedure of their judicatories; in a word, in whatever concerned the civil constitution

⁵³ Synag. Jud. cap. x.

and religion of their country. I make this distinction, of civil and religious, more in conformity to modern and Christian notions, than in reference to ancient and Jewish. In that polity, these were so interwoven, or rather blended, as to be inseparable. Their law was their religion, and their religion was their law; insomuch that with them there was a perfect coincidence in the professions of lawyer and divine. But as to their mode of education, that they had some kind of schools long before the time above mentioned, even from the beginning of their establishment, in the land of Canaan, under Joshua, or, at least, from the time of Samuel, can hardly be made a question. A certain progress in letters had been made, very early, by this people, and regularly transmitted from one generation to another. But this seems evidently to have been without such fixed seminaries as were erected and endowed afterwards; else it is impossible there should be so little notice of them in so long a tract of time, of which, as far as religion is concerned, we have a history pretty particular. All that appears before the captivity, on this subject, is, that numbers of young men were wont, for the sake of instruction, to attend the most eminent Prophets, and were therefore called the sons, that is, the disciples, of the Prophets; and that, in this manner, were constituted a sort of ambulatory schools, for communicating the knowledge of letters, and of the law. In these were probably taught the elements of the Hebrew music and versification. We are inform-

ed, also⁵⁴, that Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, sent Priests, Levites, and others, to teach in all the cities of Judah. But this appears to have been merely a temporary measure, adopted by that pious monarch for the instruction of the people in his own time, and not an establishment, which secured a succession and continuance. Now, this is quite different from the erection that obtained afterwards in their cities, of a sort of permanent academies, for the education of the youth destined for the upper stations in society.

§ 3. FURTHER, to give the greater lustre to those seminaries, they were commonly men of note, in respect of their station and quality, as well as distinguished for their learning, who were appointed to preside and teach in them. These were mostly Priests and Levites ; but not entirely ; for eminent persons, from other tribes, were also admitted to share in this honour. No sooner did erudition become an object of national attention in Judea ; no sooner were endowments made for advancing and promoting it, than the emulation of literary men was excited to attain the honours peculiar to the profession, by having the direction, or a principal part in the teaching, in some noted school. Even a certificate, from the persons qualified, of being equal to the charge, was not a little prized. Though, at first sight, it may appear but a small

⁵⁴ 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8, 9.

circumstance, it will be admitted, by the judicious, to be a considerable evidence that, in our Saviour's time, learning was in general and high esteem among the Jews; to find that those titles which related to the business of teaching, were, with so much solicitude, courted, and, with so much ostentation, displayed by persons of distinction. Of this kind, the honorary titles, *father*, *rabbi*, *doctor*, or *teacher*, *guide*, or *conductor*, the name *scribe*, often indeed a name of office, *lawyer*, *doctor of law*, may justly be accounted. I do not, however, mean to affirm, that all these titles are of different import. Some of them, as will soon appear, are justly held synonymous.

§ 4. SOME of these had come into use but a little before our Saviour's time. This was the case, in particular, of that most celebrated title *rabbi*, or *rab*, and *rabbān*, as, for some time, these seem to have been distinguished, by some difference of signification. In the Old Testament, we find the term רב *rab*, in composition with some other word, employed as a name of office and dignity, but not till the people became acquainted with the Chaldeans, concerning whom only it is used. The word, both in Hebrew and in Chaldee, signifies sometimes *great*, sometimes *many*, and when used substantively, denotes one who is at the head of any business, of whatever kind it be. Thus, רב החבל *rab hachebel*⁵⁵, is, in the Septuagint

⁵⁵ Jonah, i. 6.

πρωρευς, רב טבחִים *rab tebachim*⁵⁶, ἀρχιμαγειρος, *chief cook*. The word will bear this version, but it does not suit the context in the passage where it is found, and רב סריסִים *rab serisim*⁵⁷, ἀρχιενουχος, the first rendered, in the English version, *shipmaster*, the second, *captain of the guard*, and the third, *master of the eunuchs*. It is used in the plural also for *chief men* in general, superintendents, or those at the head of affairs. Thus, רבי חמלך *rabbe hammelech*⁵⁸, are the chief men employed by the king over the different departments of the state. It is rendered *the princes of the king* in the common translation. The original term suits entirely the import of the Latin word *princeps*, but not of the English word *prince*, at least in its most common acceptation: for it is not the king's sons, or any order of nobles, who are so denominated. The word, among the Chaldeans, appears evidently to have been equivalent to the term שר *shar* among the Hebrews. Accordingly, he who is styled by Daniel, in the passage above quoted, רב סריסִים, is four times, in the same chapter, called שר הסריסִים *shar haserisim*⁵⁹. And this use of the name *rab* seems to have continued long in Syria, as well as in Chaldaea. Thus, in the Syriac New Testament, it is found, in the same manner, united with the common appellation of any sort of officer, in order to denote the principal person in that office. Thus, *rab-cohana*⁶⁰ is the high-priest, *rab-machsa* is chief

⁵⁶ Jer. xxxix. 11.

⁵⁷ Dan. i. 3.

⁵⁸ Jer. xxxix. 13.

⁵⁹ Dan. i. 7, 8, 9. 18.

⁶⁰ Matth. xxvi. 51.

of the publicans ⁶¹, and *rabraghotha* ⁶² is chief shepherd. *Rab*, construed in this manner, is equivalent to the Greek *αρχι*, as used in composition. The preceding titles are accordingly thus expressed in the Greek, *αρχιερευς*, *αρχιτελωνης*, and *αρχιποιμην*.

Again, the word *rab* is sometimes found in that version, combined, not with the title of any sort of officer, but with a term denoting the office or charge itself; in which case it always means the person who is principally intrusted with the business. Thus, *rab-beth* ⁶³ is the steward, *επιτροπος*, he who is over the household; and *rab cano-she-tha* ⁶⁴ is the ruler of the synagogue, *αρχισυναγωγος*. It is not unlikely, though I do not find any example of it in Scripture, that the term has at first been similarly compounded with some word signifying a school, or, perhaps, with the name of the art or science taught, in order to denote the overseer of such a seminary, or the teacher of such an art. This hypothesis is at least favoured by analogy. As use, however, is variable, it appears, from what has actually happened, extremely probable, that, when all other applications of the term have been dropped, it has still remained as an honourable compellation of the learned. And when the term *rab* came to be peculiarly applied to such, the word wherewith it was, at first, for distinction's sake, compounded, would be superseded as unnecessary.

⁶¹ Luke, xix. 2.

⁶³ Matth. xx. 8.

⁶² 1 Pet. v. 4.

⁶⁴ Mark, v. 35.

It is, at least, certain, that the Jewish doctors, who resided at Babylon, about the time of our Saviour, were called simply *rab*. But, in the Old Testament, there is no trace of such a title as *rab*, *rabbi*, or *rabban*, given to a man of letters; nor is any of the old Prophets, or Scribes, or indeed, any other person, distinguished by this mark of respect prefixed to his name. Though the introduction of titles is always occasioned by the erection of useful and important offices, it is commonly in the decline of merit that pompous titles are most affected. At first, no doubt, vain-glory has led many to assume them, to whom they did not belong, in right of office, and an interested adulation has induced others to give them. Some of them, however, came soon, among the Jews, to be converted into a kind of academical distinctions, which, to give them more weight, are said to have been conferred solemnly in their schools or colleges, accompanied with certain religious ceremonies. From this practice, I may observe, by the way, sprang literary degrees in Christian universities, to which there is nothing similar, in all Pagan antiquity, either Greek or Roman, but to which the Jewish custom above mentioned bears an evident and close analogy.

§ 5. THOSE who belonged to the school were divided into three classes or orders. The lowest was that of the disciples, or learners; the second, that of the fellows, or companions, those who, having made considerable progress in learning,

were occasionally employed by the masters, in teaching the younger students. The highest was that of the preceptors, or teachers, to whom they appropriated the respectful title of *doctor*, or *rabbi*, which differs from *rab* only by the addition of the affix pronoun of the first person. All belonging to the school were accounted honourable, in a certain degree. Even the lowest, the name *disciple*, was considered as redounding to the honour of those youths, who were selected from the multitude, had the advantage of a learned education, and by their diligence and progress, gave hopes that they would, one day, fill with credit the most important stations. The title, *companion*, *fellow*, or *associate*, was considered as very honorable to the young graduate who obtained it, being a public testimony of the proficiency he had made in his studies. And the title *rabbi* was their highest academical honour. That it was only the youth, in what are called the genteeler stations, who had the advantage of a learned education, is manifest from the contempt which our Lord's parentage drew on him, as a teacher, from his fellow-citizens. *Whence, say they*⁶⁵, *hath this man this wisdom? Is not this the carpenter's son?* They conclude that he must be illiterate, from the mean condition of his parents. It was not the children of such, then, we may reasonably infer, who were trained in those seminaries.

In the Gospels, *διδασκαλος* is given as the Greek translation of the Syriac *rabbi*⁶⁶. Yet this word

⁶⁵ Matth. xiii. 54, 55.

⁶⁶ John, i. 38.

does not, as the Greek, literally signify *teacher*; but, having been conferred, at first, as a mark of respect on actual teachers, and afterwards on other learned men, *διδασκαλος* was justly accounted as apposite a version as the Greek language afforded. It is certain, the term *rabbi* began soon to be used with great latitude. But though it came gradually to be bestowed on those who were not actual teachers, it always retained, ever since it had been appropriated to the learned, a relation to learning; and, being understood as an addition due only to literary merit, it still denoted, that though the person who enjoyed it, might not be actually employed in teaching, he was well qualified for the office. *Rabban* is not the name of a degree superior to *rabbi*, though it seems intended for heightening the signification. It may be understood to denote eminent or learned *rabbi*, and appears to have been but very seldom used. The title *rabboni*, which we find twice given to our Lord, is *rabban*, with the addition of the affix of the first person, and accommodated to the pronunciation of Judea. One of those who addressed him with this compellation, was blind Bartimeus, when he applied for the recovery of his sight⁶⁷. The other was Mary Magdalene, when she first saw Jesus after his resurrection⁶⁸.

That the use of the term *rabban* has not extended far beyond Palestine, may be presumed

⁶⁷ Mark, x. 51.

⁶⁸ John, xx. 16.

from the following circumstance. Though the word *rabbi* is very common in the Syriac translation, the Greek *διδασκαλε* being generally so rendered; yet in the only place where that translator introduces the word *rabboni*, which is that quoted from John, he prefixes *in Hebrew*, that is, in the dialect of Palestine, which was then so called, adding the explanation given by the Evangelist, *that is, teacher*; which plainly shows that the word *rabboni* was not Syriac. This is the more remarkable, as in the other passage, where the historian interprets the word *rabbi*, in the same manner, adding ⁶⁹ *ὁ λεγεται ἐρμηνευομενον διδασκαλε*, that interpreter omits this explanatory clause as intended only for the Grecian reader, and of no use to those who understood Syriac. In the passage in Mark, where *rabboni* occurs, as the Evangelist had added no explanation, his interpreter has not thought it necessary to change their own word *rabbi*. This is an evidence that he also considered the difference in signification between the two words as inconsiderable. Another strong presumption of the same point is, that the Apostle John explains both by the same Greek word ⁷⁰.

It may be observed here by the way, that they likewise used to raise the import of a title by doubling it. Thus our Lord, speaking of the Pharisees, says, They love to be called of men *rabbi, rabbi* ⁷¹. In this manner he was himself

⁶⁹ John, i. 38.

⁷⁰ i. 39. xx. 16.

⁷¹ Matth. xxiii. 7.

addressed by Judas, at the time when that disciple chose to assume the appearance of more than ordinary regard⁷². The title *κυριε* seems to have been used in the same manner. Not every one who saith unto me *Lord, Lord, κυριε, κυριε*,⁷³. This is very agreeable to the genius of the Oriental tongues, which often, by the repetition of an adjective, express the superlative degree.

§ 6. I took notice once before that, in the common version of the Gospels, *διδασκαλος* is generally rendered *master*. I cannot say that the word is mistranslated when so rendered, since it is the most common title with us, wherewith scholars address their teacher. But is rather too indefinite, as this term does not distinguish the relation meant from almost any other relation, wherein superior and inferior are brought together. The word *master* serves equally for rendering *κυριος, δεσποτης, επιστατης, καθηγητης*, as for *διδασκαλος*. And, therefore, in many cases, especially where the context requires a contradistinction to any of those terms, the word *master* is not proper. It is indeed evident to me, that in the ordinary Hellenistic use, it corresponds nearly to the English word *doctor*. Both are honorary titles, expressive of the qualifications of the persons to whom they are given. Both are literary titles that relate to no other sort of merit but learning; and both are solemnly conferred with certain ceremonies which

⁷² Mark, xiv. 45.

⁷³ Matth. vii. 21.

we call *graduation*, by those who are accounted the proper judges. Our translators have, in one place, very properly rendered it *doctor*. Joseph and Mary, we are told⁷⁴, found Jesus in the temple sitting *in the midst of the doctors*, εν μεσω των διδασκαλων. To have said, in the midst of the masters, would have been a very vague expression of the sense. Nor have we reason to believe that it would have been proper here to translate the word *teachers*, as it did not imply that they were such by profession. In composition, our interpreters have commonly rendered it *doctors*⁷⁵. *There were Pharisees and νομοδιδασκαλοι, doctors of the law sitting by*. Again⁷⁶, *There stood up one of the council, a Pharisee named Gamaliel, νομοδιδασκαλος, a doctor of law*. Besides, we are accustomed to hear the words *Jewish rabbies*, and *Jewish doctors* used synonymously. In Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew, the rabbies are always called διδασκαλοι.

§ 7. But it may be objected that this does not account for the application of the title to our Lord. As he did not derive his doctrine from any of those learned seminaries, frequented by such of the youth as were reckoned the flower of the nation, the name *doctor* could not, with propriety, be applied to him. In answer to this, let it be observed, first, that as in Judea at that time they spoke not Greek, but a dialect of Chaldee, not differing considerably from what is called Syriac,

⁷⁴ Luke, ii. 46.

⁷⁵ Luke, v. 17.

⁷⁶ Acts, v. 34.

it is evident that the actual compellation, whereby our Saviour was addressed, was *rabbi*. For this we have the express testimony of the Apostle John, in a passage lately quoted, who, though writing in a different tongue, thought proper to mention the title usually given him in the language of the country, adding, merely for the sake of those readers who knew nothing of the Oriental languages, that it is equivalent to the Greek *διδασκαλος*. Now, as the Chaldaic word does not literally signify *teacher*, which the Greek word does, their equivalence must arise solely from the ordinary application of them as titles of respect to men of learning; and in this view the English word *doctor* is adapted equally to the translation of both.

Secondly, though the title *rabbi* could regularly be conferred only by those who had the superintendency of their schools, we have ground to believe that with them, as with us, the people would be ready to give the compellation through courtesy, and on the presumption that it had been conferred, wherever they saw or supposed distinguished abilities in learning: and this is most probably the reason why we find it given also to John the Baptist⁷⁷.

Thirdly, in the Jewish state, a divine commission was conceived to confer all sorts of dignities and honours, in an eminent manner, and so superseded ordinary rules, and human destinations. On this account they considered a prophet, though

⁷⁷ John, iii. 26.

not of the sacerdotal family, as an extraordinary priest, and entitled to offer sacrifice, in consideration of the evidences he gave of his mission. Thus the Prophets Samuel⁷⁸ and Elijah⁷⁹ (neither of whom was a priest) offered sacrifice with acceptance, and upon altars too not warranted by the law. It is evident that some of those who gave the title of *rabbi* to our Saviour, were willing, either sincerely or pretendedly, thus to account for their doing so. *Rabbi*, said Nicodemus, a Pharisee, and a member of the Sanhedrim⁸⁰, *we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou dost, except God be with him.* Here he, as it were, assigns the reason why he saluted him *rabbi*, although he knew that he had not been educated in human literature, and had not received from men any literary honours. The same title was given him also by others of that sect insidiously, when, though they pretended friendship, their aim was to entangle him in his talk, that they might have a pretext for delivering him up to the Roman governor. In other cases they show sufficiently how little they were disposed to admit his right to any degree of respect arising from knowledge. They said⁸¹, *How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?* A charge, the truth of which our Lord very readily admitted by replying, *My doctrine is not mine, but his who sent me.*

⁷⁸ 1 Sam. vii. 9.

⁷⁹ 1 Kings, xviii. 31, &c.

⁸⁰ John, iii. 1, &c.

⁸¹ John, vii. 15.

§ 8. Now, from the foregoing observations, it appears that the name *διδασκαλος*, as being nearly equivalent in import to the appellation *rabbi*, for which it has been substituted by the Evangelist, may be fitly expressed, either by the English term *doctor*, or by the Syriac *rabbi*, which is now so much naturalized amongst us, that its meaning, as a Jewish title of literary honour, can hardly be mistaken. In the addresses made to our Lord in his lifetime, the Syriac term is surely preferable; the English word, though very apposite in respect of its origin, and ordinary acceptation, has considerably sunk in its value, in consequence of the slight manner wherein we are accustomed to hear it applied. But we all know that *rabbi* among the Jews of that age was a title in the highest degree respectful, and on that account interdicted by their Master, even to the Apostles themselves. It is also the word by which *διδασκαλος* is commonly rendered in the Syriac version of the New Testament, justly held the most respectable of all the translations extant, as being both the oldest, and-written in a language not materially different from that spoken by our Lord and his Apostles. The difference appears not to be greater (if so great) than that which we observe between the Attic and the Ionic dialects in Greek. But when *διδασκαλος* is construed with other words, which either limit or appropriate it, we commonly judge it better to render it *teacher*, according to the simple and primitive signification of the word. In such cases it is probable,

that the writer alludes merely to what is usually implied in the Greek term. So much for the import of *rabbi* or *διδασκαλος* in the New Testament.

§ 9. Now, when we compare the titles *kyrios* and *didascalos* together, in respect of the Jewish use and application of them, we find several remarkable differences between them. From our modes of thinking, we should be apt to conclude, that the former of these appellations would be much the more honourable of the two. Yet this is far from holding generally, though, in particular cases, it no doubt does. In regard to the term *kyrios*, I observed formerly, that as it originally signified *master*, as opposed to *servant*, it retained in that nation, in our Saviour's time, so much of its primitive meaning, as to be always understood to imply, in the person who gave the title, an acknowledged inferiority to him to whom it was given. Civility might lead a man to give it to his equal. But to give it to one who, either in the order of nature, or by human conventions, was considered as inferior and subordinate, would have looked more like an insult, than like a compliment. Hence it must be regarded as a term purely relative, which derived its value solely from the dignity of the person who seriously bestowed it. To be entitled to this compellation from a monarch neither tributary nor dependent, denoted him who received it to be superior to human. But no useful citizen was so low as

not to be entitled to this mark of respect from a common beggar. And, as its value in every instance depended solely on the dignity of the giver, it might be either the most honourable title that could be conferred, or the most insignificant. The use of the title *rabbi didascalos*, or doctor, was, in this respect, totally different. As it was understood to express not relation, but certain permanent qualifications in the person who received it, they did not consider it as a matter of courtesy, but as a matter of right. It was not relative but absolute. The same person did not (as was the case of *kyrios*) consider himself as obliged to give it to one, and entitled to receive it from another. Whoever had this literary degree conferred on him, was entitled to receive the honourable compellation equally from all persons, superiors, inferiors, and equals. And we need not doubt that this vain-glorious race would brand with the ignominious character of rusticity all who withheld it.

§ 10. HENCE we may discover the reason why our Lord, when warning his disciples⁸² against imitating the ostentation and presumption of the Scribes and Pharisees, in affecting to be denominated *rabbi*, father, guide, or conductor, does not once mention *kyrios*, though, of all titles of respect, the most common. It is manifest that his view was not to prohibit them from giving or

⁸² Matth. xxiii. 7, &c.

receiving the common marks of civility, but to check them from arrogating what might seem to imply a superiority in wisdom and understanding over others, and a title to dictate to their fellows—a species of arrogance which appeared but too plainly in the Scribes and learned men of those days. As to the title *kyrios*, he knew well that from their worldly situation and circumstances (which in this matter were the only rule,) they could expect it from none but those in the lowest ranks, who would as readily give it to an artisan or a peasant, and that therefore there could be no danger of vanity from this quarter. But the case was different with titles expressive not of fleeting relations, but of those important qualifications which denote a fitness for being the lights and conductors of the human race. The title *father*, in the spiritual or metaphoric sense, the most respectful of all, he prohibits his disciples from either assuming or giving, chusing that it should be appropriated to God; and at the same time claims the title of guide and spiritual instructor to himself.

§ 11. Nor let it be imagined that the title *διδασκαλοι*, bestowed on the first ministers of the religion of Christ, stands in opposition to the admonitions here given. The word, it must be owned, is equivocal, but is every where easily distinguished by the connection; for when it is applied to such as are literally employed in teaching, it must not be understood as a complimentary title answering to the Chaldaic word *rabbi*, but as a name of

office corresponding to the Hebrew word מלמד *melammed, teacher, preceptor*. Besides, when applied even to the Apostles, it is to be understood in a subordinate sense. They are in like manner called *shepherds*, but still in subordination to him who is the *chief Shepherd*, as well as the *chief Teacher* in his church. Christ is called the only foundation; *for other foundation, says Paul⁸³, can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ*. Yet the same Apostle does not hesitate to represent the church⁸⁴ as *built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*. Nor does he consider his styling himself the father of those in whose conversion he had been instrumental, as either incompatible with, or derogatory from, the honour of him who alone is our Father, and who is in heaven. When his meaning is so evident, no mistake can arise from the word. *It is the spirit that quickeneth, said our Lord⁸⁵, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*. Now the spirit of the precept is transgressed, when his ministers claim an undue superiority over their Lord's heritage, arrogating to themselves a dominion over the faith of his disciples; and when, in consequence of an undue attachment to worldly honours, or to the power that is understood to accompany these, men become solicitous of being distinguished from their equals, either by external marks of homage, or by an implicit deference and submission in point of judgment. With this character Diotre-

⁸³ 1 Cor. iii. 11.⁸⁴ Eph. ii. 20.⁸⁵ John, vi. 63.

phes⁸⁶ seems to have been charged, whom the Apostle John denominates *φιλοπρωτειων*, one who loves pre-eminence, a character which, not many ages after, became too general in the church.

§ 12. It was not, therefore, so much the titles, as that sort of authority which was understood, among the Jews, to be conveyed under them, that was our Saviour's object in those admonitions. Indeed a fondness for title, a solicitude about precedency, or an affectation of being distinguished by such outward marks of reverence, are evidently condemned by him, as a kind of earthly ambition unbecoming the meekness and humility of his disciples, and that unremitted deference to the divine authority, which they ought ever to maintain. The practice of the Apostles, and indeed the whole tenour of the New Testament, supply us with this commentary on the words. Whereas the customary marks of mere civil respect, so far from being condemned in Scripture, are always used by the inspired penmen themselves, when there is a proper occasion of giving them.

§ 13. So much for the import of the principal titles of honour which occur in the New Testament, and the difference, in respect of application, between them and those commonly supposed to correspond to them, amongst us.

⁸⁶ 3 John, 9.

END OF VOLUME FIRST.

Feb. 5. 1833.

March 26. 1851.

THE
FOUR GOSPELS,
TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.
WITH
PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,
AND
NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY GEORGE CAMPBELL, D.D. F.R.S. EDINBURGH.

Principal of the Marischal College, Aberdeen.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

ΜΟΝΗ ΟΥΤΕΟΝ ΤΗ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ.

BOSTON :

PUBLISHED BY TIMOTHY BEDLINGTON AND CHARLES EWER.

Treadwell's Power Press.—T. H. Carter, Printer.

1824.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

DISSERTATION VIII.

	PAGE
<i>Observations on the Manner of rendering some Words to which there are not any that perfectly correspond in modern Languages.</i>	1
PART I. Weights, Measures, and Coins	2
PART II. Rites, Festivals, and Sects	21
PART III. Dress, Judicatories, and Offices	27

DISSERTATION IX.

<i>Inquiry whether certain Names which have been adopted into most Translations of Scripture in the West, coincide in Meaning with the original Terms from which they are derived, and of which they are used as the Version</i>	58
PART I. Of Mystery	60
PART II. Of Blasphemy	76
PART III. Of Schism	104
PART IV. Of Heresy	115

DISSERTATION X.

PAGE

The chief Things to be attended to in translating.—A comparative View of the opposite Methods taken by Translators of Holy Writ.

PART I. The things to be attended to in translating,	142
PART II. Strictures on Arias Montanus	146
PART III. Strictures on the Vulgate	164
PART IV. Strictures on Castalio	180
PART V. Strictures on Beza	206

DISSERTATION XI.

Of the Regard which, in translating Scripture into English, is due to the Practice of former Translators, particularly of the Authors of the Latin Vulgate, and of the common English Translation.

PART I. The Regard due to the Vulgate	241
PART II. The Regard due to the English Translation	306

DISSERTATION XII.

An Account of what is attempted in the Translation of the Gospels, and in the Notes here offered to the Public.

PART I. The essential Qualities of the Version	330
PART II. The Readings of the Original here followed	392
PART III. The Dialect employed	421
PART IV. The outward Form of the Version	441
PART V. The Notes	463

Preliminary Dissertations.

DISSERTATION THE EIGHTH.

Observations on the Manner of rendering some Words, to which there are not any that perfectly correspond in Modern Languages.

IT was observed in a former Dissertation¹, that there are words in the language of every people, which are not capable of being translated into that of any other people who have not a perfect conformity with them in those customs or sentiments which have given rise to those words. The terms comprehended under this remark, may be distributed into three classes. The first is, of weights, measures, and coins: the second of rites, sects, and festivals: the third of dress, judicatories, and offices.

¹ Diss. II. P. I. § 5.

PART I.

WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND COINS.

As to the first class, it is evident that there is nothing, wherein nations, especially such as are distant from one another in time and place, more frequently differ, than in the measures and coins, which law or custom has established among them. Under coins I shall here include weights; because it was chiefly by weight that money was anciently distinguished. As commonly, in every country, the people have names only for their own, it is often necessary, in the translation of ancient and foreign books, to adopt their peculiar names, and by mentioning in the margin the equivalent in our own money, measures, and weights, to supply the reader with the proper information. This method has accordingly been, often, though not always, taken by the translators of holy writ. Into the common version of the Old Testament, several Oriental, and other foreign, names, have been admitted, which are explained in the margin. Hence we have *shekel*, *ephah*, *bath*, *homer*, *cor*, and some others. This, however (for what reason I know not,) has not been attempted in the New Testament. Instead

of it, one or other of these two methods has been taken : either some name of our own, supposed to be equivalent, or at least not strictly confined, by use, to a precise meaning, is adopted, such as *pound, penny, farthing, bushel, firkin* ; or (which is the only other method ever used by our translators) some general expression is employed ; as, *a piece of money, a piece of silver, tribute money, a measure*, and the like. These are three ways, every one of which has some advantages, and some disadvantages, and is, in some cases, the most eligible, and not in others.

One *Monsieur le Cene*, a French writer, who, in the end of the last century, wrote what he called, a Project for a new Translation of the Bible into French, has recommended a fourth method, which is, to give in the version the exact value expressed in the money, or measures, of the country into whose language the version is made. The anonymous author of an essay, in English, for a new translation, has adopted this idea ; or rather, without naming *Le Cene*, has turned into English, and transferred to our use, all those remarks of the Frenchman, which he accounted applicable to the English version. This fourth method, though much approved by some, on account of its supposed perspicuity, is, in my judgment, the worst of them all, nor do I know a single instance wherein I could say that it ought to be adopted ².

² Till I read it lately in Dr. Geddes' Prospectus, I did not know that *Le Cene* had published a version of the Scriptures.

§ 2. BUT, before I enter on the discussion of these methods, it is proper here to premise that, as to measures, the inquiry may well be confined to those called measures of capacity. The smaller length measures have originally, in every country, been borrowed from some of the proportions which take place in the human body. Hence *inch, handbreadth, span, foot, cubit*. The larger measures, *pace, furlong, mile*, are but multiples of the less. Now, as there is not an exact uniformity of measure in the parts of individuals, it would naturally follow, that different nations would establish, for themselves, standard measures, not much different from those of others, nor yet entirely the same. And this is what, in such measures, has actually happened. When any of them, therefore, is mentioned, we know the measure nearly, but cannot know it accurately, till we are informed of what nation it is the *inch, span, foot, cubit, &c.* The names have, by use, acquired a latitude and a currency in these different

The attentive reader will perceive that the criticisms which follow, in relation to him, do not refer to that translation, which I never saw, but solely to his plan. If his version be conformable to his own rules, it is certainly a curiosity of its kind. But that cannot be; otherwise the learned Doctor, though not profuse in its praise, would not, on some points, have spoken so favourably as he has done. Could he have said, for instance, that he is very seldom biassed by party prejudices? If Le Cene was faultless on this article, much may be said to exculpate Beza. Their parties were different, but their error was the same. See Diss. X. P. V. § 13.

applications. As to superficial measure, we know it is reckoned no otherwise than by the square of the long measure. Whereas, the cubical form, not answering so well in practice to the mensuration of solids, the standards for them have generally been fixed, without any regard to measures of length or surface. It is with these alone therefore that we are here concerned.

§ 3. Now, the best way of determining our choice properly, among the different methods of translating above mentioned, is by attending to the scope of the passages wherein the mention of money and measures is introduced. First, then, it sometimes happens, that accuracy, in regard to the value of these, is of importance to the sense. Secondly, it sometimes happens, that the value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure, is of no consequence to the import of the passage. Thirdly, it happens also, sometimes, that though the real value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure, does not affect the sense of the passage, the comparative value of the different articles mentioned, is of some moment for the better understanding of what is said. Let us consider what methods suit best the several cases now mentioned.

§ 4. FIRST, I observed that accuracy, in regard to the value of the measures or coins mentioned, is sometimes of importance to the sense. When this is the case, and when we have no word ex-

actly corresponding in import to the original term, that term ought to be retained in the version, and explained in the margin, according to the first method taken notice of. An instance, where the knowledge both of the capacity of the measure and of the value of the coin, are essential to the sense, we have, in that public cry, *Χοιμῆ σιτου δηναριου*³, which our translators render, *a measure of wheat for a penny*. It is evidently the intention of the writer to inform us of the rate of this necessary article, as a characteristic of the time whereof he is speaking. But our version not only gives no information on this head, but has not even the appearance of giving any, which the word *chænix* would have had, even to those who did not understand it. But to say *a measure*, without saying what measure, is to say just nothing at all. The word *penny*, here, is also exceptionable, being used indefinitely, insomuch that the amount of the declaration is, *a certain quantity of wheat for a certain quantity of money*. This suggests no idea of either dearth or plenty; and can be characteristical of no time, as it holds equally of every time. In this case, the original term, notwithstanding its harshness, ought to be retained in the text, and explained in the margin. Again, it was, doubtless, the intention of the sacred penman, to acquaint us at how low a price our Saviour was sold by his treacherous disciple, when he informs us⁴, that the chief priests agreed to give

³ Rev. vi. 6.

⁴ Matth. xxvi. 15.

Judas *τριαχοντα αργυρια*. In like manner, when the Evangelist mentioned ⁵ the indignant observation of Judas, that the ointment, wherewith our Lord's feet were anointed, might have been sold for more than *τριαχοσιων δηναριων*, it was, doubtless, his view to acquaint us with the value of the gift. Once more, when Philip remarked to our Lord, who had proposed to feed the multitude in the desert ⁶, *διαχοσιων δηναριων αρτοι*, *two hundred pennyworth of bread*, as it runs in the common version, *is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little*, it was the design of the historian to supply us with a kind of criterion for computing the number of the people present. But this could be no criterion, unless we knew the value of the *δηναριον*.

§ 5. 'BUT,' say those modern correctors, 'in the examples above mentioned, when the knowledge of the value of the coin, and the capacity of the measure, is of importance to the sense, no method can be equal, in point of perspicuity, to that recommended by us, whereby both are reduced to an equivalent, in the moneys and measures of the country. Thus, the first passage quoted would be rendered, *A measure of wheat, capable of supporting a man for one day*,' for thus Le Cene proposes to translate *χοιλιξ*, *for sevenpence halfpenny.*' 'The second, *The chief priests covenanted with Judas for three pounds fifteen shillings sterling.* The third,

⁵ John, xii. 5.

⁶ John, vi. 7.

‘ *Why was not this ointment sold for nine pounds seven shillings and sixpence? And the fourth, Six pounds five shillings would not purchase bread sufficient.*’

The exceptions against this method are many. In the first place, it is a mere comment, and no translation. Considered as a comment, it may be good; but that must be egregiously wrong as a version, which represents an author as speaking of what he knew nothing about, nay, of what had no existence in his time. And such, surely, is the case with our sterling money, which an interpretation of this sort would represent as the current coin of Judea in the time of our Saviour. Nothing ought to be introduced by the translator, from which the English reader may fairly deduce a false conclusion, in regard to the manners and customs of the time. Besides, as the comparative value of their money and measures with ours is not founded on the clearest evidence, is it proper to give a questionable point the sanction, as it were, of inspiration? Add to all this, that no method can be devised, which would, more effectually than this, destroy the native simplicity and energy of the expression. What is expressed in round numbers, in the original, is, with an absurd minuteness, reduced to fractions in the version. Nothing can be more natural than the expression, *Two hundred denarii would not purchase bread enough to afford every one of them a little.* This is spoken like one who makes a shrewd guess from what he sees. Whereas, nothing can be

more unnatural than, in such a case, to descend to fractional parts, and say, *Six pounds five shillings would not purchase*. This is what nobody would have said, that had not previously made the computation. Just so, the round sum of three hundred denarii might very naturally be conjectured, by one present, to be about the value of the ointment. But, for one to go so nearly to work as to say, *Nine pounds seven shillings and sixpence might have been gotten for this liquor*, would directly suggest to the hearers, that he had weighed it, and computed its value at so much a pound. There is this additional absurdity in the last example, that it is said, *επανω*, *more than*: consequently, it is mentioned, not as the exact account, but as a plausible conjecture, rather under than above the price. But does any body, in conjectures of this kind, acknowledged to be conjectures, descend to fractional parts?

§ 6. Now, if this method would succeed so ill, in the first of the three cases mentioned, it will be found to answer still worse in the other two, where little depends on the knowledge of the value. In the second, I may say, nothing depends on it. Now, there are several passages, wherein coins and measures are mentioned, in which the value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure, is of no conceivable consequence to the import of the passage. In this case, either the second or the third method, above specified, is preferable to the introduction of a foreign term, not used in other places of the version, and noway necessary

to the sense. But let it be observed of the second method, that I am never for using such names of coins and measures as are peculiarly modern, or European, and not applied to the money and measures of ancient and Oriental countries : for such terms always suggest the notion of a coincidence with us, in things wherein there was actually no coincidence.

We read in the common version⁷, *Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, ὑποτον μοδιον, but on a candlestick.* Every person must be sensible, that the size of the measure is of no consequence here to the sense : the intention being solely to signify, that a light is brought, not to be covered up, but to be placed where it may be of use in lighting the household. The general term *corn-measure*, perfectly answers the author's purpose in this place ; and as nowhere, but in the expression of this very sentiment, does the word *μοδιος* occur in the Gospels, there is no reason for adopting it. The term *bushel* serves well enough for conveying the import of the sentiment ; but as it indirectly suggests an untruth, namely, the ancient use of that measure in Judea, it is evidently improper. For an example in money, our Lord says, when the Pharisees interrogated him about the lawfulness of paying the tribute imposed by their conquerors⁸, *Επιδειξατε μοι δηναριον*, rendered in the common version, *show me a penny*, the sequel evinces that it was of no importance what the

⁷ Matth. v. 15.

⁸ Luke, xx. 24.

value of the money was ; the argument is affected solely by the figure and inscription on it. And if, in no other place of the Gospels, the value of that coin had affected the sense more than it does here, it might have been rendered by the general phrase *piece of money*. Now let us see how *Le Cene's* method does with those two examples. In the first he would say, *Neither do men light a candle to put it under a measure which contains about a pint less than a peck*. Or, according to the manner which he sometimes adopts, *containing such a precise number of eggs*. (I do not recollect how many ;) would not this particularity in fixing the capacity of the measure, but too manifestly convey the insinuation that there would be nothing strange or improper in men's putting a lighted candle under any other measure larger or smaller than that whereof the capacity is, as a matter of principal moment, so nicely ascertained? A strange way this of rendering Scripture perspicuous!

Nor does it answer better in coins than in measures. When our Lord said, *Επιδειξατε μοι δηναριον*, the very words imply that it was a single piece he wanted to see ; and what follows supplies us with the reason. But how does this suit *Le Cene's* mode of reduction? *Show me sevenpence halfpenny*. Have we any such piece? The very demand must, to an English reader, appear capricious, and the money asked could not be presented otherwise than in different pieces, if not in different kinds. It is added, *Whose image and superscription hath it?* Is this

a question which any man would put, *Whose image and superscription hath sevenpence halfpenny?* ‘But there may have been formerly *sevenpence halfpenny pieces*, though we have none ‘now.’ Be it so. Still, as it is unsuitable to have the head and inscription of a Roman emperor on what must, from the denomination, be understood to be British coin, they ought, for the sake of consistency, and for making the transformation of the money complete, to render the reply to the aforesaid question, *George’s* instead of *Cesar’s*. If this be not translating into English, it is perhaps superior; it is what some moderns call *Englishing, making English, or doing into English*; for all these expressions are used. Poems done in this manner are sometimes more humbly termed *imitations*.

§ 7. I OBSERVED a third case that occurs in the Gospels with respect to money and measures, which is when the value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure mentioned, does not, but the comparative value of the articles specified, does, affect the sense. Of this kind some of our Lord’s parables furnish us with excellent examples. Such is the parable of the pounds⁹. I shall here give as much of it as is necessary for my present purpose, first in the vulgar translation, then in *Le Cene’s* manner. 13. *He called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.* 16. *The first came,*

⁹ Luke, xix. 13, &c.

saying, *Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds, and he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities.* Nothing can be more manifest than that it is of no consequence to the meaning and design of this brief narration, what the value of the pound was, great or little. Let it suffice that it here represents the whole of what we receive from our Creator to be laid out in his service. In the accounts returned by the servants, we see the different improvements which different men make of the gifts of heaven; and in the recompenses bestowed, we have their proportional rewards. But these depend entirely on the numbers mentioned, and are the same, whatever be the value of the money. I shall now, in reducing them to our standard, follow the rates assigned on the margin of the English Bible. Ducats, so often mentioned by *Le Cene*, are no better known to the generality of our people, than talents or *minæ* are. Whether the rate of conversion I have adopted be just or not, is of no consequence. I shall therefore take it for granted, that it is just. The different opinions of the comparative value of their money and ours, nowise affect the argument. The objections are against the reduction from the one species to the other, not against the rule of reducing.

The foregoing verses so rendered will run thus:
He called his ten servants, and delivered them

thirty-one pounds five shillings sterling, and said, Occupy till I come. The first came, saying, Lord, thy three pounds two shillings and sixpence, have gained thirty-one pounds five shillings; and he said to him, Well, thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy three pounds two shillings and sixpence, have gained fifteen pounds twelve shillings and sixpence. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five cities. In regard to the parable of the talents¹⁰, it is needless, after the specimen now given, to be particular. I shall therefore give only part of one verse thus expressed in the common version. *To one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; which, in Le Cene's manner, would be, To one he gave nine hundred thirty-seven pounds ten shillings sterling. To another three hundred seventy-five pounds. And to another one hundred eighty-seven pounds ten shillings.* In both examples, what is of real importance, the comparative degrees of improvement and proportional rewards, which in the original, and in the common version, are discovered at a glance, are, if not lost, so much obscured, by the complicated terms employed in the version, that it requires an arithmetical operation to discover them. In the example of the king who called his servants to account¹¹, this manner is, if possible, still more awkward, by reason of the

¹⁰ Matth. xxv. 14.

¹¹ Matth. xviii. 23.

largeness of the sums. One of them is represented as owing to the king one million eight hundred seventy-five thousand pounds, and his fellow-servant as indebted to him three pounds two shillings and sixpence. There is some importance in the comparative value of the denarius and the talent, as it appears evidently one purpose of our Lord, in this parable, to show how insignificant the greatest claims we can make on our fellow-creatures are, compared with those which divine justice can make on us. And, though this be strongly marked when the two sums are reduced to one denomination, this advantage does not counterbalance the badness of the expression, so grossly unnatural, unscriptural, and, in every sense, improper. In conveying religious and moral instruction, to embarrass a reader or hearer with fractions and complex numbers, is in a spirit and manner completely the reverse of our Lord's.

§ 8. I WILL not further try the patience of my readers with what has been proposed in the same taste, with respect to the measures, both liquid and dry, mentioned in Scripture, in the exhibition of their respective capacities by the number of eggs they could contain. I am afraid I have descended into too many particulars already, and shall therefore only add in general that, in this way, the beautiful and perspicuous simplicity of holy writ, is exchanged for a frivolous minuteness, which descends to the lowest denomination of parts, more in the style of a penurious

money-broker, than in that of a judicious moralist, not to say, a divine teacher. Perspicuity is therefore injured, not promoted, by it, and to those important lessons, an appearance, or rather a disguise, is given, which seems calculated to ruin their effect. The author has never reflected on what I think sufficiently obvious, that when a piece of money is named, the name is understood to denote something more than the weight of the silver or the gold. In the earliest ages, when it was only by weight that the money of the same metal was distinguished, if the weight was the same, or nearly so, the names used in different languages served equally well. It was therefore both natural and proper in the Seventy to render the Hebrew כֶּכֶר *checher*, in Greek *ταλαντον*, and שֶׁקֶל *shekel*, *διδραχμα*. For the Alexandrian *διδραχμα*, which was double the Attic referred to in the New Testament, was half an ounce. But though such terms might, with propriety, be used promiscuously, when the different denominations of money expressed solely their different weights, as was the case in the earlier ages of the Jewish commonwealth, it is not so now. The name signifies a coin of a particular form and size, stamp, and inscription. The Hebrew *shekel*, the Greek *stater*, and the British *half-crown*, being each about half an ounce of silver, are nearly equivalent. But the names are not synonymous. If one had promised to show you a *stater*, or a *shekel*, would you think he had discharged his promise by producing *half-a-crown*?

§ 9. WORDS therefore which are by use exclusively appropriated to the coins and measures of modern nations, can never be used with propriety in the translation of an ancient author. I have mentioned three ways which a translator may take, and pointed out the different circumstances by which the preference among those methods may, in any instance, be determined. When the sense of the passage does, in any degree, depend on the value of the coin, or the capacity of the measure, the original term ought to be retained, and if needful, explained, in a note. This is the way constantly used in the translation of books where mention is made of foreign coins or measures. What is more common than to find mention made, in such works, of Dutch *guilders*, French *livres*, or Portuguese *moidores*? I acknowledge, at the same time, the inconveniency of loading a version of Scripture with strange and uncouth names. But still this is preferable to expressions, which how smooth soever they be, do, in any respect, misrepresent the author, and mislead the reader. Our ears are accustomed to the foreign names which are found in the common version of the Old Testament, such as *shekel*, *bath*, *ephah*: though, where the same coins and measures are evidently spoken of in the New, our translators have not liked to introduce them, and have sometimes, less properly, employed modern names which do not correspond in meaning.

§ 10. WE have, besides, in the New Testament, the names of some Greek and Roman coins and measures not mentioned in the Old. Now, where the words are the same, or, in common use, coincident with those used by the Seventy in translating the Hebrew names above mentioned, I have thought it better to retain the Hebrew words, to which our ears are familiarized, by the translation of the Old, than to adopt new terms for expressing the same things. We ought not surely to make an apparent difference by means of the language, where we have reason to believe, that the things meant were the same. When the word, therefore, in the New Testament, is the name of either measure or coin peculiar to Greeks or Romans, it ought to be retained; but when it is merely the term by which a Hebrew word, occurring in the Old Testament, has sometimes been rendered by the Seventy; the Hebrew name, to which the common version of the Old Testament has accustomed us, ought to be preferred. For this reason, I have, in such cases, employed them in the version of the Gospels. *Αργυριον* I have rendered *shekel*, when used for money. This was the standard coin of the Jews; and when the Hebrew word for *silver* occurs in a plural signification, as must be the case when joined with a numeral adjective, it is evidently this that is meant. It is commonly in the Septuagint rendered *αργυρια*, and in one place, in the common translation, *silverlings*¹². In Hebrew כֶּסֶף *cheseph* and שֶׁקֶל

¹² Isaiah, vii. 23.

shekel, are often used indiscriminately, and both are sometimes rendered by the same Greek word. Though talent is not a word of Hebrew extraction, the Greek *ταλαντον* is so constantly employed by the Seventy in rendering the Hebrew כֶּכֶר *checher*, and is so perfectly familiar to us, as the name of an ancient coin of the highest value, that there can be no doubt of the propriety of retaining it. As to the word *pound*, in Greek *μνα*, and in Hebrew מָנָה *maneh*, as the sense of the only passage wherein it occurs in the Gospel, could hardly, in any degree, be said to depend on the value of the coin mentioned, I have also thought proper to retain the name which had been employed by the English translators. Though *pound* is the name of a particular denomination of our own money, we all know that it admits also of an indefinite application to that of other nations. This is so well understood, that where there is any risk of mistaking, we distinguish our own by the addition of *sterling*. The Greek word and the English are also analogous in this respect, that they are names both of money and of weight. Both also admit some latitude, in the application to the moneys and weights of different countries, whose standards do not entirely coincide.

In regard to some other words, though *penny* is often used indefinitely, the common meaning differs so much from that of *δηνάριον* in Scripture, and the plural *pence* is so rarely used with that latitude, that I thought it better to retain the Latin word. I have reserved the word *penny* as a more proper translation of *ασσαριον*, between which and

a *penny sterling*, the difference in value is inconsiderable. This naturally determined me to render *κοδραντης farthing*; for *κοδραντης* (that is, *quadrans*) is originally a Latin word, as well as *δηναριον*. They correspond in etymology as well as in value¹³. By this I have avoided a double impropriety into which our translators have fallen. First, by rendering *δηναριον* a *penny*, and *ασσαριον* a *farthing*, they make us consider the latter as a fourth part of the former, whereas it was but one-tenth. Again, by rendering *ασσαριον* and *κοδραντης* by the same word, they represent those names as synonymous which belong to coins of very different value. In translating *λεπτον*, I have retained the word *mite*, which is become proverbial for the lowest denomination of money. Disquisitions on little points, more curious than useful, I always endeavour to avoid.

§ 11. As to measures, wherever the knowledge of the capacity was of no use for throwing light on the passage, I have judged it always sufficient to employ some general term, as *measure, barrel, &c.* Of this kind is the parable of the unjust steward. The degree of his villany is sufficiently discovered by the numbers. But where it is the express view of the writer to communicate some notion of the size and capacity, as in the account given of the water-pots at the marriage in Cana, or wherever such knowledge is of importance to the sense, those general words ought not to be

¹³ *Farthing* from the Saxon *feorthling*, that is, the fourth part.

used. Such are the reasons for the manner which I have adopted in this work, in regard to money and measures. There is no rule that can be followed which is not attended with some inconveniences. Whether the plan here laid down be attended with the fewest, the judicious and candid reader will judge.

PART II.

rites, festivals, and sects.

THE second class of words to which it is not always possible to find in another language equivalent terms, is the names of rites, festivals, and sects, religious, political, or philosophical. Of all words the names of sects come the nearest to the condition of proper names, and are almost always considered as not admitting a translation into the language of those who are unacquainted with the sect. This holds equally of modern, as of ancient, sects. There are no words in other languages answering to the English terms *whig* and *tory*, or to the names of the Italian and German parties called *guelph* and *ghibelin*. It is exactly the same with philosophical sects, as *magian*, *stoic*, *peripatetic*, *epicurean*; and with the religious sects among the Jews, *pharisee*, *sadducee*,

essene, karaite, rabbinist. Yet even this rule is not without exception. When the sect has been denominated from some common epithet or appellation thought to be particularly applicable to the party, the translation of the epithet or appellation, serves in other languages as a name to the sect. Thus those who are called by the Greeks *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκατιται*, from their celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of the month, were, by the Romans, called *quartadecimani*, which is a translation of the word into Latin. In like manner, our *quakers* are called in French *trembleurs*. Yet in this their authors are not uniform; they sometimes adopt the English word. In regard to the sects mentioned in the New Testament, I do not know that there has been any difference among translators. The ancient names seem to be adopted by all.

§ 2. As to rites and festivals, which, being nearly related, may be considered together, the case is somewhat different. The original word, when expressive of the principal action in the rite, or in the celebration of the festival, is sometimes translated, and sometimes retained. In these it is proper to follow the usage of the language, even although the distinctions made may originally have been capricious. In several modern languages we have, in what regards Jewish and Christian rites, generally followed the usage of the old Latin version, though the authors of that version have not been entirely uniform in their method. Some words they have transferred

from the original into their language ; others they have translated. But it would not always be easy to find their reason for making this difference. Thus the word *περιτομη* they have translated *circumcisio*, which exactly corresponds in etymology ; but the word *βαπτισμα* they have retained, changing only the letters from Greek to Roman. Yet the latter was just as susceptible of a literal version into Latin as the former. *Immersio tinctio*, answers as exactly in the one case, as *circumcisio* in the other. And if it be said of those words, that they do not rest on classical authority, the same is true also of this. Etymology, and the usage of ecclesiastic authors, are all that can be pleaded.

Now, the use with respect to the names adopted in the Vulgate, has commonly been imitated, or rather implicitly followed, through the western parts of Europe. We have deserted the Greek names where the Latins have deserted them, and have adopted them where the Latins have adopted them. Hence we say *circumcision*, and not *peritomy* ; and we do not say *immersion*, but *baptism*. Yet when the language furnishes us with materials for a version so exact and analogical, such a version conveys the sense more perspicuously than a foreign name. For this reason, I should think the word *immersion* (which, though of Latin origin, is an English noun, regularly formed from the verb *to immerse*,) a better English name than *baptism*, were we now at liberty to make a choice. But we are not. The latter term has been introduced, and has obtained the

universal suffrage : and, though to us not so expressive of the action ; yet, as it conveys nothing false, or unsuitable to the primitive idea, it has acquired a right by prescription, and is consequently entitled to the preference.

§ 3. I SAID that, in the names of rites or sacred ceremonies, we have commonly followed the Vulgate. In some instances, however, we have not. The great Jewish ceremony, in commemoration of their deliverance from Egypt, is called in the New Testament *πασχα*, the sacred penmen having adopted the term that had been used by the Seventy, which is not a Greek word, but the Hebrew, or rather the Chaldaic, name in Greek letters. The Vulgate has retained *pascha*, transferring it into the Latin character. The words in Greek and Latin have no meaning but as the name of this rite. In English the word has not been transferred, but translated *passover*, answering in our language to the import of the original Hebrew. *Σκηνοπηγια*, *scenopegia*, in the Gospel of John¹⁴, is retained by the Vulgate, and with us translated *the feast of tabernacles*. It would have been still nearer the original Hebrew, and more conformable to the Jewish practice, to have called it *the feast of booths*. But the other appellation has obtained the preference. The Latins have retained the Greek name *azyma*, which we render, properly enough, *unleavened*

¹⁴ John, vii. 2.

bread. But the words *jubilee, sabbath, purim,* and some others, run through most languages.

§ 4. THERE is a conveniency in translating, rather than transplanting, the original term, if the word chosen be apposite, as it more clearly conveys the import, than an exotic word, that has no original meaning or etymology in the language. This never appears in a stronger light than when the reason of the name happens to be assigned by the sacred author. I shall give, for instance, that Hebrew appellative, which I but just now observed, that both the Seventy and the Vulgate have retained in their versions, and which the English interpreters have translated. The word is, *pascha, passover.* In the explanation which the people are commanded to give of this service to their children, when these shall inquire concerning it, the reason of the name is assigned¹⁵: *Ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's PASSOVER, who PASSED OVER the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians.* Now, this reason appears as clearly in the English version, which is literal, as in the original Hebrew; but it is lost in the version of the Seventy, who render it thus: *Ερειτε Θυσια το ΠΑΣΧΑ τουτο Κυριω, ως ΕΣΚΕΠΑΣΕ τους οικους των υιων Ισραηλ εν Αιγυπτω, ηνικα επαταξε τους Αιγυπτιους.* Here, as the words *πασχα* and *εσκεπασε* have no affinity, it is impossible to discover the reason of the name. The authors of the Vulgate, who form

¹⁵ Exodus, xii. 27.

the word *phase*, in the Old Testament, more closely after the Hebrew (though they call it *pascha* in the New,) have thought proper, in turning that passage, to drop the name they had adopted, and translate the word *transitus*, that the allusion might not be lost. *Dicetis, victima TRANSITUS Domini est, quando TRANSIVIT super domos filiorum Israel in Ægypto, percutiens Ægyptios.*

This manner is sometimes necessary, for giving a just notion of the sense. But it is still better when the usual name, in the language of the version, as happens in the English, preserves the analogy, and renders the change unnecessary. In proper names, it is generally impossible to preserve the allusion in a version. In such cases, the natural resource is the margin. The occasion is not so frequent in appellatives, but it occurs sometimes. It is said, by Adam, of the woman¹⁶, soon after her formation, *She shall be called WOMAN, because she was formed out of MAN.* Here the affinity of the names, woman and man, is preserved, without doing violence to the language. But, in some versions, the affinity disappears altogether, and, in others, is effected by assigning a name which, if it may be used at all, cannot, with propriety, be given to the sex in general. It is lost in the Septuagint. *Ἄυτη κληθήσεται ΓΥΝΗ, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἈΝΔΡΟΣ αὐτῆς ἐληφθῆ ἄυτη.* Not the shadow of a reason appears in what is here assigned as the reason. The sounds *γυνη* and *ανδρος* have no

¹⁶ Gen. ii. 23.

affinity. The same may be said of *mulier* and *vir* in Castalio's Latin. *Hæc vocabitur MULIER, quia sumpta de VIRO est.* Other Latin interpreters have, for the sake of that resemblance in the words, on which the meaning of the expression depends, chosen to sacrifice a little of their latinity. The Vulgate, and Leo de Juda, have, *Hæc vocabitur VIRAGO, quia sumpta de VIRO est.* Junius, Le Clerc, and Houbigant, use the word *vira*, upon the authority of Festus. Neither of the words is good in this application; but not worse than *ανδρῖς* εἰς *ανδρῶς*, used by Symmachus for the same purpose. Much in the same taste are Luther's *mænnin*, the *homasse* of the Geneva French, and the *huoma* of Diodati's Italian.

PART III.

DRESS, JUDICATORIES, AND OFFICES.

I SHALL NOW proceed to the third general class of words, not capable of being translated, with exactness, into the language of a people whose customs are not in a great measure conformable to the customs of those amongst whom such words have arisen. This class comprehends names relating to dress, peculiar modes, judicatories, and offices. In regard to *garments*, it is well known,

that the usages of the ancients, particularly the Orientals, differed considerably from those of modern Europeans. And though I am by no means of opinion, that it is necessary, in a translation, to convey an idea of the exact form of their dress, when nothing in the piece translated appears to depend on that circumstance, I am ever for avoiding that which would positively convey a false notion in this or any other respect. Often, from that which may be thought a trivial deviation from truth, there will result inconveniences, of which one at first is not aware, but which, nevertheless, may produce in the mind of the attentive reader, unacquainted with the original, objections that affect the credibility of the narration. A general name, therefore, like *clothes, raiment*, is sufficient, when nothing depends on the form, in like manner as *a piece of money, a corn measure*, will answer, when no light, for understanding the scope of the place, can be derived from the value of the one, or the capacity of the other. Where some distinction, however, seems to have been intended in the passage, there is a necessity for using names more definitive. It is not often necessary, for naming the parts of dress, to retain the terms of a dead language. The English translators have never done it, as far as I remember, except in naming that part of the sacerdotal vestments, called the *ephod*, for which it would be impossible to find an apposite term in any European tongue. *Phylacteries*, too, will perhaps be accounted an exception.

§ 2. BUT, though it is rarely necessary to adopt the ancient or foreign names of garments, it may not be always proper to employ those terms for expressing them, which are appropriated to particular pieces of the modern European habit. The word *coat* answers well enough as a name for the under garment, in Greek *χιτων*. *Cloak*, by which our translators in the New Testament commonly render *ἱματιον*, the name for the upper garment, I do not so much approve. My reasons are these: First, *cloak* is not the term that they have used in the Old Testament for that vestment; though we have no reason to believe that there was any change in the Jewish fashions in this particular. It is well known, that the modes, respecting dress, are not, nor ever were, in Asia, as at present they are in Europe, variable and fluctuating. The Orientals are as remarkable for constancy in this particular, as we are for the contrary. Now, though the Hebrew words, answering to *ἱματιον*, are frequent in the Old Testament, and the Greek word itself in the translation of the Seventy, the word *cloak* has never been admitted by our translators into the version of the Old Testament, except once in Isaiah¹⁷, where it is used only as a simile. Wherever they have thought proper to distinguish the upper garment from that worn close to the body, they have named it the *mantle*. See the places marked in the margin¹⁸.

¹⁷ Isaiah, lix. 17. ¹⁸ Judges, iv. 18. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14.

1 Kings, xix. 13. 19. 2 Kings, ii. 8. 13, 14. Ezra, ix. 3. 5. Job, i. 20. Job, ii. 12. Psal. cix. 29.

But these are not all the places in which the original word might have been so rendered. Sometimes, indeed, it means garments in general, and in the plural especially, signifies *clothes*. Now, though the difference of a name employed in the version of the Old Testament may be thought too slight a circumstance for founding an argument upon, in regard to the manner of translating the New, I cannot help thinking that, even if the words *mantle* and *cloak* were equally proper, we ought not, by an unnecessary change, without any reason, to give ground to imagine, that there had been, in this article, any alteration in the Jewish customs.

Secondly, I am the more averse to introduce, in the New Testament, a change of the name that had been used in the Old, as it is evident that, in Judea, they placed some share of religion in retaining their ancient garb. They did not think themselves at liberty to depart from the customs of their ancestors in this point. As their law had regulated some particulars in relation to their habit, they looked upon the form as intended for distinguishing them from the heathen, and consequently as sacred¹⁹: the knots of strings which they were appointed to put upon the four corners or wings, as they called them, did not suit any other form of outer garment, than that to which they had been always accustomed.

Thirdly, the word *mantle* comes nearer a just representation of the loose vesture worn by the

¹⁹ Numb. xv. 38, 39. Deut. xxii. 12.

Hebrews, than *cloak*, or any other term, which refers us to something particular in the make. Whereas their *ματιον* was an oblong piece of cloth, square at the corners, in shape resembling more the *plaid* of a Scotch Highlander, than either the Greek *pallium* or the Roman *toga*. This mantle, it would appear, on ordinary occasions, they threw loosely about them; and, when employed in any sort of work in which it might encumber them, laid aside altogether. To this, doubtless, our Lord refers, in that expression²⁰, *Let not him who shall be in the field, return home to fetch his mantle*. When setting out on a journey, or entering on any business, compatible with the use of this garment, they tucked it up with a girdle, that it might not incommode them. Hence, the similitude of having their *loins girt*, to express alertness, and habitual preparation for the discharge of duty. I know not why those who have been so inclinable, in some other articles, to give a modern cast to the manners of those ancients, have not modernized them in this also, and transformed *girding their loins*, a very antique phrase, into *buttoning their waistcoats*. This freedom would not be so great, as the reduction of their money and measures above considered. It would not even be greater than giving them *candles for lamps*, and making them sit at their meals, instead of reclining on couches. In regard to this last mode, I propose to consider it immediately.

²⁰ Mark, xiii. 16.

§ 3. OF all their customs they were not so tenacious, as of what regarded the form of their clothes. In things which were not conceived to be connected with religion, and about which neither the law, nor tradition, had made any regulation, they did not hesitate to conform themselves to the manners of those under whose power they had fallen. A remarkable instance of this appears, in their adopting the mode of the Greeks and Romans, in lying on couches at their meals. In the Old Testament times, the practice of sitting on such occasions, appears to have been universal. It is justly remarked by Philo²¹, that Joseph “made his brethren sit down according to their ages; for men were not then accustomed to lie on beds at entertainments.” The words, in the Septuagint²², are *εκαθισαν εναντιον αυτου*: in the English translation, *They sat before him*; both literally from the Hebrew. In like manner²³, *εκαθισαν δε φαγειν αρτον*, *they sat down to eat bread*; and²⁴, *εκαθισεν ο λαος φαγειν και πιειν*, *the people sat down to eat and drink*. Solomon says²⁵, *When thou sittest to eat with a ruler, Εαν καθισης δειπνειν επι τραπεζης δυναστου*. But it were endless to enumerate all the examples. Suffice it to observe, that this is as uniformly employed to express the posture at table in the Old Testament, as *ανακλινω*, or some synonymous

²¹ *Εξης δε προβταξαντος κατα τας ηλικιας καθιζεσθαι, μηπω των ανθρωπων εν ταις συμποτικαις συνουσιαις κατακλιβει χρωμενων*. Lib. de Josepho.

²² Gen. xliii. 33.

²³ Gen. xxxvii. 25.

²⁴ Exod. xxxii. 6.

²⁵ Prov. xxiii. 1.

term, is employed, for the same purpose, in the New. The Hebrew word is equally unequivocal with the Greek. It is always **יָשַׁב** *jashab*, to sit, never **שָׁכַב** *shachab*, or any other word that imports lying down.

Some, indeed, have contended, that this manner of eating was practised among the Jews before the captivity; and in support of this opinion, have produced the passage in Samuel²⁶, where Saul is spoken of as eating on the bed. But the passage, when examined, makes clearly against the opinion for which it has been quoted. The historian's expression is, *sat upon the bed*. Nor is this, as in the New Testament, the style merely of modern translators; it is that of the original, as well as of all the ancient translations. The Septuagint says *εκαθισε*, the Vulgate *sedit*. Houbigant is the only translator I know (who, misled, I suppose, by the ordinary style of Latin authors,) has said *decubuit*. The Hebrew word is **יָשַׁב** *jashab*, which never signifies *to lie*. Now, whether a man on a bed takes his repast sitting, after the European manner, with his feet on the floor, or after the Turkish, with his legs across under him, his posture differs totally from that of the ancient Greeks and Romans, who lay at their length.

The words of the Prophet Amos²⁷ have also been thought to favour the same opinion: *Wo to them that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of*

²⁶ 1 Sam. xxviii. 23.

²⁷ Amos, vi. 4, &c.

the flock, and the calves out of the stall, that chant to the sound of the viol, &c. Here the Prophet upbraids the people with their sloth and luxury, specifying a few instances in their manner of living. But nothing is said that implies any other connection among these instances, than that of their being the effects of the same cause, *voluptuousness*. We have no more reason to connect their eating the lambs and the calves with their lying stretched on beds of ivory, than we have to connect with this posture, their chanting to the sound of the viol, and anointing themselves with ointments.

But in the Apocryphal writings, which are posterior in composition to those of the Old Testament, and probably posterior to the Macedonian conquests, though prior to the books of the New, we have the first indications of this change of posture. It is said of Judith²⁸ in the common version, that *her maid laid soft skins on the ground for her over against Holofernes, that she might sit and eat upon them*, *εις το εσθιειν κατακλινομενην επ' αυτων*, literally, that *she might eat lying upon them*. Again, in Tobit²⁹, *ανεπεσα του φαγειν*, not *I sat*, but *I lay down to eat*. Other examples might be given which render it probable that this fashion was first introduced into Judea by the Greeks, before the Jews became acquainted with the Romans. A sure evidence this, that the Jews were not so obstinately tenacious of every national custom, as some have represented them. It is

²⁸ Judith, xii. 15.

²⁹ Tobit, ii. 1.

very remarkable that, in our Saviour's time, the change was so universal in Judea, that the very common people always conformed to it. The multitudes which our Lord twice fed in the desert, are by all the Evangelists represented as *lying*, not *sitting*, upon the ground. It is strange that our translators have here, by misinterpreting one word, as invariably exhibited them practising a custom which they had abandoned, as they had formerly, by the unwarranted and unnecessary change of a name, given ground to think that there was an alteration in their customs, when there was none.

§ 4. I KNOW it is commonly pleaded in excuse for such deviations from the original, as that whereof I am now speaking, that the posture is a circumstance noway material to the right understanding of the passages wherein it is occasionally mentioned; that besides, to us moderns, there appears in the expressions *lying down to eat*, and *laying themselves at table*, from their repugnancy to our customs, an awkwardness which, so far from contributing to fix our minds on the principal scope of the author, would divert our attention from it. In answer to the first of these objections, I admit that it is sometimes, not always, as will soon be shown, of no consequence to the import of a passage, whether a mere circumstance, which is but occasionally mentioned, and on which the instruction conveyed in the story does not depend, be rightly apprehended or not. The two miracles of the loaves and fishes are to all valuable

purposes the same, whether the people partook of their repast sitting or lying. The like may be said of the greater part of such narratives. For this reason I do not except against a general expression, as, *placed themselves at table*, where a literal version would be attended with the inconvenience of appearing unnatural: but I could never approve, for the sake of elegance or simplicity, a version which, in effect, misrepresents the original; or, in other words, from which one may fairly deduce inferences that are not conformable to fact. Concerning the other exception, I cannot help observing, that it is only because the expression *lying at table* is unusual, that it appears awkward. If the first translators of the Bible into English had thought fit, in this instance, to keep close to the original, the phrases would not now have sounded awkwardly. But it must be owned that no translators enjoy at present equal advantages with those who had, in a manner, the forming of our language, in regard to things sacred. Their versions, by being widely dispersed, would soon give a currency to the terms used in them, which there was then no contrary use to counterbalance. And this is the reason why many things which might have been better rendered then, cannot now so well be altered.

§ 5. But to show that even such errors in translating, however trivial they may appear, are sometimes highly injurious to the sense, and render a plain story not only incredible but absurd, I must

entreat the reader's attention to the following passage, as it runs in the common version³⁰: *One of the Pharisees desired Jesus that he would eat with him; and he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And behold a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.* Now a reader of any judgment will need to reflect but a moment to discover, that what is here told is impossible. If Jesus and others were in our manner sitting together at table, the woman could not be behind them, when doing what is here recorded. She must in that case, on the contrary, have been under the table. The chairs, on which the guests were seated, would have effectually precluded access from behind. It is said also that she stood, while she bathed his feet with tears, wiped them with the hairs of her head, anointed and kissed them. Another manifest absurdity. On the supposition of their sitting, she must have been at least kneeling, if not lying on the floor. These inconsistencies instantly disappear, when the Evangelist is allowed to speak for himself, who, instead of saying that *Jesus sat down*, says expressly that he *lay down*, *ανεκλιθη*. And to prevent, if possible, a circumstance being

³⁰ Luke, vii. 36, 37, 38.

mistaken or overlooked, on which the practicability of the thing depended, he repeats it* by a synonymous term in the very next verse. "When she knew that Jesus lay at table," *ανακειται*. The knowledge of their manner at meals makes every thing in this story level to an ordinary capacity.

§ 6. AT their feasts, matters were commonly ordered thus: Three couches were set in the form of the Greek letter *II*, the table was placed in the middle, the lower end whereof was left open, to give access to the servants, for setting and removing the dishes, and serving the guests. The other three sides were inclosed by the couches, whence it got the name of *triclinium*. The middle couch, which lay along the upper end of the table, and was therefore accounted the most honourable place, and that which the Pharisees are said particularly to have affected, was distinguished by the name *πρωτοκλισια*³¹. The person intrusted with the direction of the entertainment was called *αρχιτρικλινος*³². The guests lay with their feet backwards, obliquely, across the couches, which were covered, for their better accommodation, with such sort of cloth, or tapestry, as suited the quality of the entertainer. As it was necessary, for the conveniency of eating, that the couches should be somewhat higher than the table, the guests have probably been raised by them three feet, and upwards, from the floor.

³¹ Matth. xxiii. 6.

³² John, ii. 8.

When these particulars are taken into consideration, every circumstance of the story becomes perfectly consistent and intelligible. This also removes the difficulty there is in the account given, by John³³, of the paschal supper, where Jesus being set, as our translators render it, at table, one of his disciples is said, in one verse, to have been leaning on his bosom, and in another, to have been lying on his breast. Though these attitudes are incompatible with our mode of sitting at meals, they were naturally consequent upon theirs. As they lay forwards, in a direction somewhat oblique, feeding themselves with their right hand, and leaning on their left arm; they no sooner intermitted, and reclined a little, than the head of each came close to the breast of him who was next on the left. Now, a circumstance (however frivolous in itself) cannot be deemed of no consequence, which serves to throw light upon the sacred pages, and solve difficulties, otherwise inextricable. This case, though not properly requiring the use of any ancient or foreign name, I could not help considering minutely in this place, on account of its affinity with the other topics of which I had been treating.

§ 7. I SHALL add a few things, on the manner adopted by other translators in rendering what relates to this usage. With regard to the Latin versions, it may naturally be supposed, that the

³³ John, xiii. 23. 25.

Vulgate would be literal, and consequently, in this particular, just. There was no temptation to depart from the letter. It suited their customs at that period, as well as the idiom of their language. And though it did not suit the customs of the times of modern Latin interpreters, they could have no motive, in this article, to desert the manner of the ancient translator, expressed in a phraseology which both Latin and Greek classics had rendered familiar. As to the translations into modern tongues, Luther appears to have been the first who, in his translation into German, has, in this particular, forced the Evangelists into a conformity with modern fashions. The translator into modern Greek has adopted the same method, putting *εκαθισε* for *ανεκλιθη*, &c. The French translator, Olivetan, has avoided the false translation of *sitting* for *lying*, and also the apparent awkwardness of a literal version. In the passage from Luke, above quoted, he says, *Il se mit à table*; and speaking of the woman, *Laquelle ayant connu qu'il etoit à table*. In the miraculous increase of the loaves and the fishes in the desert³⁴, he thus expresses himself: *Il commanda aux troupes de s'arranger par terre*. Diodati has, in the first of these passages, adopted the same method with the French translator, saying, *si mise a tavola*; and *ch'egli era a tavola*; in the other, he has fallen into the error of our common version, and said *Jesu commandò alle turbe, che si mettessero a sedere in terra*. Most other French

³⁴ Matth. xv. 35.

versions have taken the same method of eluding the difficulty. But all the late English versions I have seen, follow implicitly the common translation.

§ 8. To come now to offices and judicatories : it must be acknowledged that, in these, it is not always easy to say, as was remarked in a preceding Dissertation³⁵, whether the resemblances to, or differences from, offices and judicatories of our own, ought to induce us to retain the original term, or to translate it. But whatever be in this, or however the first translators ought to have been determined in their choice between these methods, the matter is not equally open to us in this late age as it was to them. The election made by our predecessors, in this department, has established an use which, except in some particular cases, it would be dangerous in their successors to violate ; and which, therefore, unless where perspicuity or energy requires an alteration, ought to be followed. For example, who could deny, that the Greek terms, *αγγελος*, *αποστολος*, *διαβολος*, might not have been as well rendered *messenger*, *missionary*, *slanderer*, as the words *ιερευς*, *υπηρετης*, *αντιδικος*, are rendered *priest*, *minister*, *adversary*. In regard to the import of the words, there does not appear to me to be a closer correspondence in the last mentioned, than in the first. Besides, as the first are themselves

³⁵ Diss. II. P. I. § 5.

no other than Greek translations of the Hebrew words שטן, שלוח, מלאך, *satan, shaluch, malach*, which the Seventy have not judged necessary to retain in another language, and in this judgment have been followed by the writers of the New Testament; they have given the example of translating, rather than transferring, these appellatives into other languages; the last name, *satan*, being the only one which is ever retained by them, and that very seldom.

But the true source of the distinction that has been made in this respect by European translators, is not any particular propriety in the different cases, but the example of the old Latin translator. The words which he retained, with such an alteration in the orthography as adapted them to the genius of the tongue, we also retain; and the words which he translated, we translate. Because he said *angelus, apostolus, diabolus*, which are not properly Latin words, we say *angel, apostle, devil*, not originally English. Had he, on the contrary, used the terms *nuncius, legatus, calumniator*, we had probably substituted for them, *messenger, missionary, slanderer*, or some terms equivalent. For, in those cases wherein the Latin interpreter has not scrupled to translate the Greek by Latin words, neither have we scrupled to render them by English words. I am, however, far from affirming that the interpreters of the Latin church, either in the old Italic, or in the present Vulgate, have acted from caprice in their choice; though I do not always discover reasons

of such weight for the distinctions they have made, as should lead us implicitly to follow them.

There is only one example in titles of this sort, wherein the moderns have taken the freedom to judge differently. The Greek *παρακλητος*, in John's Gospel, is always retained by the author of the Vulgate, who uses *paracletus*, but has not been followed by later translators. Erasmus has sometimes adopted this word, and sometimes said *consolator*, and is followed in both, by the translator of Zurich. Castalio says *confirmator*, and Beza *advocatus*. Most modern versions into Italian, French, and English, have, in this instance, followed Erasmus, in the import they have given the word, in preference even to Beza. And of these our common version is one, using the word *comforter*. Nay, some French translators from the Vulgate have deserted that version, rendering the word either *consolateur* or *avocat*. In general, I would pay that deference to the example of the ancient interpreters as to prefer their manner, wherever there is not, from perspicuity, energy, or the general scope of the discourse, positive reason to the contrary. Such reason, I think, we have in regard to the title last mentioned³⁶. As to the term *διαβολος*, I have already considered the cases in which it is not proper to render it *devil*³⁷. The name *αποστολος* is so much appropriated in the New Testament, to a particular class of extraordinary ministers,

³⁶ See the note on John, xiv. 16.

³⁷ Diss. VI. Part I. § 2, 3, 4.

that there are very few cases, and none that I remember in the Gospels, where either perspicuity or energy would require a change of the term.

§ 9. IT is otherwise with the name *αγγελος*, in regard to which there are several occurrences, where the import of the sentiment is, if not lost, very much obscured, because the word in the version has not the same extent of signification with that in the original. It was observed before³⁸, that there is this difference between the import of such terms, as they occur in their native tongues, whether Hebrew or Greek, and as modernized in versions, that, in the former, they always retain somewhat of their primitive signification, and beside indicating a particular being or class of beings, they are of the nature of appellatives, and mark a special character, function, or note of distinction in such beings; whereas, when latinized or englished, but not translated into Latin or English, they answer solely the first of those uses, and approach the nature of proper names. Now, where there happens to be a manifest allusion in the original, to the primitive and ordinary acceptance of the word in that language, that allusion must be lost in a translation, where the word is properly not translated, and where there is nothing in the sound that can suggest the allusion. It is particularly unfortunate, if it be in an argument; as the whole will be necessarily involved in darkness.

³⁸ Diss. VI. Part I. § 1.

§ 10. I SHALL illustrate the preceding observations by some remarks on the following passage³⁹.
 4. *Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they:* 5. *For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son.* 6. *And again when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.* 7. *And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.* 8. *But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*
 I cannot help thinking with Grotius, that there is here a comparison of the dignity of the different personages mentioned, from the consideration of what is imported in their respective titles. This is at best but obscurely suggested in the common version. For though the word *son* is expressive of a natural and near relation, the word *angel* in our language is the name of a certain order of beings, and beside that, expresses nothing at all. It is not, like the original appellation, both in Hebrew and in Greek, a name of office. Further, the seventh verse, as it stands with us, *Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire*, is unintelligible; and if some mystical sense may be put upon it, this is at best but a matter of conjecture, and appears quite unconnected with the argument. It is well known that

³⁹ Heb. i. 4, &c.

the word *πνευματα* rendered *spirits*, signifies also *winds*. That this is the meaning of it here, is evident from the passage⁴⁰ whence the quotation is taken. For the Hebrew *רוח ruach*, is of the same extent. And though it be in that place, for the sake of uniformity, rendered the same way as here, nothing can be more manifest, than that the Psalmist is celebrating the wonders of the material creation, all the parts of which execute, in their different ways, the commands of the Creator. Our translators not only render the same Hebrew word *wind* in the third verse, and *spirits* in the fourth, but in this last evidently start aside from the subject. Nothing, on the contrary, can be better connected than the whole passage in the true, which is also the most obvious, interpretation, and may be thus expressed: *Who covereth himself with light as with a mantle, who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain; who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters; who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh on the wings of the wind; who maketh winds his messengers, and flaming fire his ministers*⁴¹; who

⁴⁰ Psal. civ. 4.

⁴¹ Dr. Lowth (*De sacra Poesi Hebræorum*, Præl. viii.) though he retains the word *angelus*, understands the passage just as I do, making winds the subject, and angels a metaphorical attribute. “*Faciens ut venti sint angeli sui, ut ignis ardens sit sibi ministrorum loco.*” He adds: “*Describuntur elementa in exequendis Dei mandatis, prompta et expedita quasi angeli, aut ministri tabernaculo deservientes.*” Houbigant to the same purpose, “*Facit angelos suos, ventos, et istros suos ignem rutilantem.*”

hath laid the foundations of the earth, that it should never be removed. There is an internal probability of the justness of this version, arising from the perspicuous and close connection of the parts, and an improbability in the common version, arising from their obscurity and want of connection; verse 4. *Who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flame of fire,* being a digression from the scope of the context, the material world, to the world of spirits.

Now, let us try, in the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews referred to, how the same translation of the words *πνευμα* and *αγγελος* by *wind* and *messenger*, through the whole, will suit the Apostle's reasoning. Speaking of our Lord, he says, *Being as far superior to the heavenly messengers, as the title he hath inherited is more excellent than theirs; For to which of those messengers did God ever say, "Thou art my Son, I have to-day begotten thee:" And again, "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son:"* Again, when he introduceth the first-born into the world, he saith, *"Let all God's messengers worship him."* Whereas, concerning messengers, he saith, *"Who maketh winds his messengers, and flaming fire his ministers:"* But to the Son, *"Thy throne, O God, endureth for ever."* To me it is plain, first, that the aim of his reasoning is to show the superior excellency of the Messiah, from the superiority of his title of *Son*, given him in a sense peculiar to him (and which, from analogy to the constitution of the universe, should imply of the same nature with the Father,) to

that of *messenger*, which does not differ essentially from servant. Now the English word *angel* does not express this. It is a name for those celestial beings, but without suggesting their function. Secondly, that, in proof of the inferiority of the title *messenger*, the writer urges, that it is sometimes given even to things inanimate, such as storms and lightning.

Every reader of reflection admits, that there runs, through the whole passage, a contrast of the things spoken concerning the Messiah, to the things spoken concerning angels, in order to show the supereminence of the former above the latter. The seventh verse, as now rendered, perfectly suits this idea, and completes one side of the contrast. But does it answer this purpose in the common version? Not in the least: for, will any one say, that it derogates from the highest dignity to be called a *spirit*, when it is considered that God himself is so denominated? And as the term, *flaming fire*, when applied to intelligent beings, must be metaphorical, the consideration that, by such metaphors, the energy and omniscience of the Deity are sometimes represented, will, in our estimation, serve rather to enhance than to depress the character. The case is totally different, when *flaming fire*, or lightning, in the literal sense, is made the subject of the proposition, and *God's messengers* the predicate. But it may be asked, Do not the words in the Greek oppose this supposition, inasmuch as *τους αγγελους αυτου* *his messengers* has the article, and

should therefore be understood as the subject, whereas *πνευματα* having no article must be the predicate ; but let it be remarked, that the article is found only in the translation of the Seventy, which is copied by the apostle. In the Hebrew, neither term has the article ; the subject therefore must be determined by the scope of the place.

§ 11. I KNOW that it has been objected to this interpretation, that *רוח* *ruach*, though used in the singular for *wind*, does not occur, in this sense, in the plural, except when joined with the numeral adjective *four*. But from this, though it were true, we can conclude nothing. That the word is found in this meaning, in the plural, is a sufficient ground for interpreting it so, when the connection requires it. Farther, though it were conclusive, it is not true. In Jeremiah⁴², we find, in the same passage, both *ארבע רוחות* *arbang ruchoth*, *four winds*, and *כל חרוחות* *col haruchoth*, *all the winds*, where it was never doubted, that both expressions were used of *the winds*. As to the insinuation which some have thrown out concerning this explanation, as unfavourable to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, it can be accounted for only from that jealousy, an invariable attendant on the polemic spirit, which still continues too much to infect and dishonour theological inquiries. This jealousy, however, appears so much misplaced here, that the above interpretation is manifestly

⁴² Jer. xlix. 36.

more favourable to the common doctrine than the other. I say not this to recommend it to any party, knowing that, in these matters, we ought all to be determined by the impartial principles of sound criticism, and not by our own prepossessions.

§ 12. BUT to return : a second case, wherein it is better to employ the general word *messenger*, is, when it is not clear, from the context, whether the sacred penmen meant a celestial, or a terrestrial, being. In such cases, it is always best to render the term, so as that the version may admit the same latitude of interpretation with the original ; and this can be effected only by using the general term. For this reason, in the following expressions, *οιτινες ελαβετε τον νομον εις διαταγας αγγελων*⁴³, and *διαταγεις δι' αγγελων εν χειρι μεσιτου*⁴⁴, it would have been better to translate *αγγελων messengers*, as it is not certain whether such extraordinary ministers as Moses and Joshua, and the succeeding Prophets, be meant, or any of the heavenly host. The same may be said of that passage, *οφειλει η γυνη εξουσιαν εχειν επι της κεφαλης, δια τους αγγελους*⁴⁵, it being very doubtful whether the word, in this place, denotes *angels* or *men*.

§ 13. A THIRD case, wherein (I do not say it must, but) it may, properly be rendered *messengers*, is when, though it evidently refers to superior

⁴³ Acts, vii. 53.

⁴⁴ Gal. iii. 19.

⁴⁵ 1 Cor. xi. 10.

beings, it is joined with some word or epithet, which sufficiently marks the reference, as *αγγελος Κυριου*, a messenger of the Lord, *οι αγγελοι των ουρανων*, the heavenly messengers, *οι αγιοι αγγελοι*, the holy messengers; for, with the addition of the epithet, the English is just as explicit as the Greek. Not but that such epithets may in some sense be applied to men also; but it is customary with the sacred writers thus to distinguish the inhabitants of heaven. In this case, however, it must be admitted, that either way of translating is good. There is one advantage in sometimes adopting this manner, that it accustoms us to the word *messenger* in this application, and may consequently assist the unlearned in applying it in doubtful cases. In some cases, not doubtful, to add the word *heavenly* in the version, is no interpolation, for the single word *αγγελος* often includes it. Thus, though the word *γλωσσα* originally means no more than *tongue*, it is frequently employed to denote an unknown or foreign tongue⁴⁶.

§ 14. A FOURTH case, wherein the general term is proper, is when the word is applied to a human being. This rule, however, admits some exceptions, soon to be taken notice of. Our translators have rightly rendered it *messenger*, in the instances which fall under this description noted in the

⁴⁶ Diss. XII. P. IV. § 9.

margin ⁴⁷, wherein they are not only human beings that are meant, but the message is from men.

§ 15. I SAID, that there are some exceptions from this rule. The first is, when not only the message is from God, but when it appears to be the view of the writer to show the dignity of the mission, from the title given to the missionary, as being a title which he has in common with superior natures : in such cases, it is better to preserve in the version the term *angel*, without which the allusion is lost, and by consequence justice is not done to the argument. For this reason the word *angel* ought to be retained in the noted passage of the Gospels concerning John the Baptist ⁴⁸: *What went ye to see? A Prophet? Yea, I tell you, and something superior to a Prophet; for this is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold I send mine angel before thee, who shall prepare thy way."* There is, manifestly, couched here a comparison between the two titles *prophet* and *angel*, with a view to raise the latter. Now, to this end the common English word *messenger* is not adapted, as it does not convey to us the idea of greater dignity than that of a Prophet, or even of so great. My argument here may be thought not quite consistent with what I urged in my first remark on this word. But the two cases are rather opposite than similar. The allusion was there to the ordinary signification of the term;

⁴⁷ Luke, vii. 24. ix. 52. James, ii. 25.

⁴⁸ Matth. xi. 9, 10.

the allusion is here not to the signification, but to the common application of it, to beings of a superior order. The intention was there, comparatively, to depress the character, the intention here is to exalt it.

§ 16. ANOTHER case, in which the word *angel* ought to be retained, though used of man, is when there would arise either obscurity or ambiguity from the construction, if the word *messenger* should be employed. It cannot be doubted, that the angels of the seven churches mentioned in the Apocalypse⁴⁹, are human creatures; but the term *messenger* would render the expression ambiguous or rather improper. The messenger of societies (in like manner as of individuals,) is one sent by them, not to them. In this, and some other instances, the Greek *αγγελος* is to be understood as corresponding in extent of signification to the Hebrew מַלְאָךְ *malach*, which often denotes a *minister*, or servant employed in any charge of importance and dignity, though not a message. It would, therefore, be no deviation from what is included in the Hellenistic sense of the word, if, through the whole of that passage, it were rendered *president*.

§ 17. IN what concerns civil offices, our translators have, very properly, retained some names to which we have none entirely equivalent. Of

⁴⁹ Rev. i. 20. ii. 1. 3. 12. 18. iii. 1. 7. 14.

this number is the name *tetrarch*, which admits no explanation but by a periphrasis. *Centurion* and *publican* are of the same kind. The word *legion*, though not a name of office, being the name of a military division, to which we have not any exactly corresponding, may be ranked in the same class. The three words last specified are neither Hebrew nor Greek, but Latin; and as they are the names of things familiar only to the Latins, they are best expressed by those names of Latin derivation employed by our translators. Two of them occur in the Latin form in the New Testament, *λεγεων*, and *κεντυριων*, though for the latter word the Greek *εκατονταρχος* is oftener used.

It may be proper here to observe, in regard to such Latin appellatives, that from the connection which has subsisted between all European countries and the Romans, and from the general acquaintance which the Western nations have long had with the ancient Roman usages, history, and literature; their names of offices, &c. are naturalized in most modern languages, particularly in English. This makes the adoption of the Latin name for an office, or any other thing which the Jews had solely from the Romans, peculiarly pertinent. The remark now made holds, especially when the persons spoken of were either Romans, or the servants of Rome. If, therefore, after the Vulgate, we had rendered *χιλιαρχος* *tribune*, *ανθυπατος* *proconsul*, and perhaps *σπειρα* *cohort*, the expression, without losing any thing, in perspicuity, to those of an inferior class; would have been, to

the learned reader, more significant than *chief-captain, deputy, band.*

The word *ηγεμων* also, though sometimes a general term, denoting *governor* or *president*; yet, as applied to Pilate, is known to import no more than *procurator*. Properly there was but one *president* in Syria, of which Judea was a part. He who had the superintendency of this part was styled *imperatoris procurator*. For this we have the authority of *Tacitus* the Roman annalist, and of *Philo* the Alexandrian Jew. And though the author of the Vulgate has commonly used the term *præses* for *ηγεμων*; yet, in translating Luke⁵⁰, he has rendered *ηγεμονευοντιος Ποντιου Πιλατου της Ιουδαιας, procurante Pontio Pilato Judæam*. To those who know a little of the language, or even of the history, of ancient Rome, the Latin names, in many cases, are much more definite in their signification, than the words by which they are commonly rendered, and, being already familiar in our language, are not, even to the vulgar, more obscure than names originally English, relating to things wherewith they are little acquainted. For a similar reason, I have also retained the name *prætorium*, which, though a Latin word, has been adopted by the sacred writers, and to which neither common-hall nor judgment-hall entirely answers. That the Evangelists, who wrote in Greek, a more copious language, found themselves compelled to borrow from the Latin, the name of what belonged to the

⁵⁰ Luke, iii. 1.

office of a Roman magistrate, is to their translators a sufficient authority for adopting the same method.

§ 18. I SHALL conclude this Dissertation with observing, that there are two judicatories mentioned in the New Testament, one Jewish, the other Grecian, the distinguishing names of which may, not without energy, be preserved in a translation. Though the noun *συνηδριον* is Greek, and susceptible of the general interpretation *council* or *senate*; yet, as it is commonly in the Gospels and Acts appropriated to that celebrated court of senators or *elders* accustomed to assemble at Jerusalem, and from the Greek name, called *sanhedrim*, which was at once their national senate and supreme judicatory; and, as it appears not, in those books, to have been ever applied to any other particular assembly, though sometimes to such in general as were vested with the highest authority; I have thought it reasonable to retain the word *sanhedrim*, in every case where there could be no doubt that this is the court spoken of. The name has been long naturalized in the language; and, as it is more confined in its application than any common term, it is so much the more definite and energetic. The other is the famous Athenian court called *the Areopagus*, and mentioned in the Acts⁵¹; which, as it was in several respects peculiar in its constitution, ought to be distinguished in a version, as it is in the

⁵¹ Acts, xvii. 19.

original, by its proper name. To render it *Mars-hill* from etymology, without regard to use, would entirely mislead the unlearned, who could never imagine that the historian spoke of bringing the Apostle before a court, but would suppose that he only informed us that they brought him up to an eminence in the city, from which he discoursed to the people. This is in part effected by the common version; for, though in verse 19, it is said, *They brought Paul to Areopagus*, it is added in verse 22, *Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars-hill, and said*. This leads one to think that these were two names for the same hill. *The Areopagus* with the article is the proper version in both places.

$$\sqrt{\frac{41}{33}}$$

Dissertation the Ninth.

Inquiry whether certain Names which have been adopted into most Translations of Scripture in the West, coincide in Meaning with the original Terms from which they are derived, and of which they are used as the Version.

IT was observed in a former Dissertation¹, as one cause of difficulty in the examination of the Scriptures, that before we begin to study them critically, we have been accustomed to read them in a translation, whence we have acquired a habit of considering several ancient and Oriental terms as equivalent to certain words, in modern use, in our own language, by which they have been commonly rendered. What makes the difficulty the greater is, that when we become acquainted with other versions beside that into our mother-tongue, these, instead of correcting, serve but to confirm the prejudice. For, in these translations, we find the same original words rendered by words which we know to correspond exactly in those tongues, to the terms employed in the English translation. In order to set this observation in the strongest light, it will be necessary to trace

¹ Diss. II. Part III. § 6.

the origin of some terms which have become technical among ecclesiastical writers, pointing out the changes in meaning which they have undergone. When alterations are produced gradually, they escape the notice of the generality of people, and sometimes even of the more discerning. For, a term once universally understood to be equivalent to an original term, whose place it occupies in the translation, will naturally be supposed still equivalent, by those who do not attend to the variations in the meanings of words, which a tract of time often insensibly produces. Sometimes etymology contributes to favour the deception.

How few are there, even among the readers of the original, who entertain a suspicion that the words *mystery*, *blasphemy*, *schism*, *heresy*, do not convey to moderns precisely those ideas which the Greek words (being the same except in termination) *μυστηριον*, *βλασφημια*, *σχισμα*, *αιρεσις*, in the New Testament, conveyed to Christians in the times of the Apostles? Yet, there is not such a correspondence in meaning between them, as is commonly supposed, I intend, in the present Dissertation, to put beyond a doubt. That there is a real difference, in regard to some of those words, is, I think, generally allowed by men of letters; but as all are not agreed in regard to the precise difference between the one and the other, I shall here examine, briefly, the import of the original terms, in the order above mentioned, that we may be qualified to judge how far

they are rightly rendered by the words supposed to correspond to them, and that we may not be misled, by the resemblance of sound, to determine concerning the sameness of signification.

PART I.

OF MYSTERY.

THE Greek word *μυστηριον* occurs frequently in the New Testament, and is uniformly rendered, in the English translation, *mystery*. We all know that by the most current use of the English word *mystery*, (as well as of the Latin ecclesiastic word *mysterium*, and the corresponding terms in modern languages,) is denoted some doctrine to human reason incomprehensible; in other words, such a doctrine as exhibits difficulties, and even apparent contradictions, which we cannot solve or explain. Another use of the word, which, though not so universal at present, is often to be met with in ecclesiastical writers of former ages, and in foreign writers of the present age, is to signify some religious ceremony or rite, especially those now denominated sacraments. In the communion-office of the church of England, the elements, after consecration, are sometimes termed *holy mysteries*. But this use seems not now to be common among protestants, less

perhaps in this country than in any other. Johnson has not so much as mentioned it in his Dictionary. Indeed, in the fourth, and some succeeding, centuries, the word *μυστηριον* was so much in vogue with the Greek fathers, and *mysterium* or *sacramentum*, as it was often rendered, with the Latin, that it would be impossible to say in what meaning they used the word; nay, whether or not they affixed any meaning to them at all. In every thing that related to religion, there were found *mysteries* and *sacraments*, in doctrines and precepts, in ordinances and petitions: they could even discover numbers of them in the Lord's Prayer. Nay, so late as Father Possevini, this unmeaning application of these terms has prevailed in some places. That Jesuit is cited with approbation by Walton, in the prolegomena to his Polyglot, for saying, "Tot esse Hebraica in Scriptura sacramenta, quot literæ; tot mysteria, quot puncta; tot arcana, quot apices," a sentence, I acknowledge, as unintelligible to me as Father Simon owns it was to him. But passing this indefinite use, of which we know not what to make, the two significations I have mentioned, are sufficiently known to theologians, and continue, though not equally, still in use with modern writers.

§ 2. WHEN we come to examine the scriptures critically, and make them serve for their own interpreters, which is the surest way of attaining the true knowledge of them, we shall find, if I mistake not, that both these senses are unsus-

ported by the usage of the inspired penmen. After the most careful examination of all the passages in the New Testament, in which the Greek word occurs, and after consulting the use made of the term, by the ancient Greek interpreters of the Old, and borrowing aid from the practice of the Hellenist Jews, in the writings called Apocrypha, I can only find two senses, nearly related to each other, which can strictly be called scriptural. The first, and what I may call the leading sense of the word, is *arcanum*, a secret, any thing not disclosed, not published to the world, though perhaps communicated to a select number.

§ 3. Now let it be observed, that this is totally different from the current sense of the English word *mystery*, something incomprehensible. In the former acceptation, a thing was no longer a mystery than whilst it remained unrevealed; in the latter, a thing is equally a mystery after the revelation as before. To the former we apply, properly, the epithet *unknown*, to the latter we may, in a great measure, apply the term *unknowable*. Thus, the proposition that God would call the Gentiles, and receive them into his church, was as intelligible, or, if you like the term better, comprehensible, as that he once had called the descendants of the Patriarchs, or as any plain proposition, or historical fact. Yet, whilst undiscovered, or, at least veiled under figures and types, it remained, in the scriptural idiom, a *mystery*, having been hidden from ages and generations. But, after it had pleased God to reveal this his

gracious purpose to the Apostles, by his Spirit, it was a *mystery* no longer.

The Greek words, *αποκαλυψις* and *μυστηριον*, stand in the same relation to each other, that the English words *discovery* and *secret* do. *Μυστηριον αποκαλυφθεν* is a *secret discovery*, and consequently a secret no longer. The discovery is the extinction of the secret as such. These words accordingly, or words equivalent, as *μυστηριον γνωρισθεν, φανερωθεν*, are often brought together by the Apostles, to show that what were once the secret purposes and counsels of God, had been imparted to them, to be by them promulgated to all the world. Thus, they invited the grateful attention of all, to what was so distinguished a favour on the part of heaven, and must be of such unspeakable importance to the apostate race of Adam. The terms, communication, revelation, manifestation, plainly show the import of the term *μυστηριον*, to which they are applied. As this, indeed, seems to be a point now universally acknowledged by the learned, I shall only refer the judicious reader, for further proof of it from the New Testament, to the passages quoted in the margin²; in all which, he will plainly perceive, that the Apostle treats of something which had been concealed for ages (and for that reason called *μυστηριον*;) but was then openly revealed; and not of any thing, in its own nature, dark and inconceivable.

² Rom. xvi. 25, 26. 1 Cor. ii. 7, 8, 9, 10. Eph. 1. 9. iii. 3. 5, 6. 9. vi. 19. Col. i. 26, 27.

§ 4. IF, in addition to the evidence arising from so many direct and clear passages in the writings of Paul, it should be thought necessary to recur to the usage of the Seventy, we find that, in the Prophet Daniel³, the word *μυστηριον* occurs not fewer than nine times, answering always to the Chaldaic *רִזְרָא* *raza, res arcana*, and used in relation to Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which was become *a secret*, even to the dreamer himself, as he had forgot it. The word there is uniformly rendered in the common version *secret*; and it deserves to be remarked that, in those verses, it is found connected with the verbs *γνωριζω*, *φωτιζω*, and *αποκαλυπτω*; in a way exactly similar to the usage of the New Testament above observed. It occurs in no other place of that version, but one in Isaiah, of very doubtful import. In the apocryphal writings (which, in matters of criticism on the Hellenistic idiom, are of good authority,) the word *μυστηριον* frequently occurs in the same sense, and is used in reference to human secrets, as well as to divine. Nay, the word is not, even in the New Testament, confined to divine secrets. It expresses sometimes those of a different, and even contrary, nature. Thus, the Apostle, speaking of the antichristian spirit, says, *The mystery of iniquity doth already work*⁴. The spirit of antichrist hath begun to operate; but the operation is latent and unperceived. The Gospel of Christ is a blessing, the spirit of antichrist a curse. Both

³ Dan. ii. 18, 19. 27, 28, 29, 30. 47. iv. 9.

⁴ 2 Thess. ii. 7.

are equally denominated *mystery*, or secret, whilst they remain concealed.

§ 5. I SHALL be much misunderstood, if any one infer, from what has been now advanced, that I mean to signify, that there is nothing in the doctrines of religion which is not, on all sides, perfectly comprehensible to us, or nothing from which difficulties may be raised, that we are not able to give a satisfactory solution of. On the contrary, I am fully convinced, that in all sciences, particularly natural theology, as well as in revelation, there are many truths of this kind, whose evidence such objections are not regarded by a judicious person, as of force sufficient to invalidate. For example, the divine omniscience is a tenet of natural religion. This manifestly implies God's foreknowledge of all future events. Yet, to reconcile the divine prescience with the freedom, and even the contingency, and consequently, with the good or ill desert of human actions, is what I have never yet seen atchieved by any, and indeed despair of seeing. That there are such difficulties also in the doctrines of revelation, it would, in my opinion, be very absurd to deny. But the present inquiry does not affect that matter in the least. This inquiry is critical, and concerns solely the scriptural acceptation of the word *μυστηριον*, which I have shown to relate merely to the secrecy for some time observed with regard to any doctrine, whether mysterious, in the modern acceptation of the word, or not.

§ 6. THE foregoing observations will throw some light on what Paul says of the nature of the office with which he was vested: *Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God*⁵, *οικονομοὺς μυστηρίων Θεοῦ*, dispensers to mankind of the gracious purposes of heaven, heretofore concealed, and therefore denominated secrets. Nor can any thing be more conformable than this interpretation, both to the instructions given to the Apostles, during our Lord's ministry, and to the commission they received from him. In regard to the former, he tells them, *To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; no secret, relating to this subject, is withheld from you; but to them it is not given*⁶; that is, not yet given. For these very Apostles, when commissioned to preach, were not only empowered, but commanded, to disclose to all the world⁷, the whole mystery of God, his secret counsels in regard to man's salvation. And that they might not imagine that the private informations, received from their Master, had never been intended for the public ear, he gave them this express injunction, *What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light. And what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.* He assigns the reason, the divine decree; a topic to which he oftener than once recurs. *There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known*⁸.

⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

⁶ Matth. xiii. 41.

⁷ Matth. xxviii. 19. Mark, xvi. 15.

⁸ Matth. x. 26, 27.

Again: *There is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad*⁹. This may serve to explain to us the import of these phrases which occur in the Epistles, as expressing the whole Christian institution, *the mystery of the gospel, the mystery of the faith, the mystery of God, and the mystery of Christ*; mystery, in the singular number, not mysteries, in the plural, which would have been more conformable to the modern import of the word, as relating to the incomprehensibility of the different articles of doctrine. But the whole of the gospel, taken together, is denominated *the mystery*, the grand secret, in reference to the silence or concealment under which it was formerly kept; as, in like manner, it is styled the revelation of Jesus Christ, in reference to the publication afterwards enjoined.

§ 7. I SIGNIFIED, before, that there was another meaning which the term *μυστηριον* sometimes bears in the New Testament. But it is so nearly related to, if not coincident with, the former, that I am doubtful whether I can call it other than a particular application of the same meaning. However, if the thing be understood, it is not material which of the two ways we denominate it. The word is sometimes employed to denote the figurative sense, as distinguished from the literal, which is conveyed under any fable, parable, allegory, symbolical action, representation, dream, or vision.

⁹ Mark, iv. 22.

It is plain that, in this case, the term *μυστηριον* is used comparatively; for, however clear the meaning intended to be conveyed in the apologue, or parable, may be to the intelligent, it is obscure, compared with the literal sense, which, to the unintelligent, proves a kind of veil. The one is, as it were, open to the senses; the other requires penetration and reflection. Perhaps there was some allusion to this import of the term, when our Lord said to his disciples, *To you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God; but to them that are without, all these things are done in parables*¹⁰. The Apostles were let into the secret, and got the spiritual sense of the similitude, whilst the multitude amused themselves with the letter, and searched no further.

In this sense, *μυστηριον* is used in these words: *The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches*¹¹. Again in the same book: *I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, &c.*¹². There is only one other passage, to which this meaning of the word is adapted, and on which I shall have occasion to remark afterwards¹³. *This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church*¹⁴. Nor is it any objection to this inter-

¹⁰ Mark, iv. 11.¹¹ Rev. i. 20.¹² Rev. xvii. 7.¹³ Diss. X. Part III. § 9.¹⁴ Eph. v. 32.

pretation of the word *mystery* here, that the Apostle alluded not to any fiction, but to an historical fact, the formation of Eve out of the body of Adam her husband. For, though there is no necessity that the story which supplies us with the body of the parable or allegory (if I may so express myself,) be literally true; there is, on the other hand, no necessity that it be false. Passages of true history are sometimes allegorized by the sacred penmen. Witness the story of Abraham and his two sons, Isaac by his wife Sarah, and Ishmael by his bond-woman Hagar, of which the Apostle has made an allegory for representing the comparative natures of the Mosaic dispensation and the Christian¹⁵.

§ 8. As to the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Ephesians, let it be observed, that the word *μυστηριον* is there rendered in the Vulgate, *sacramentum*. Although this Latin word was long used very indefinitely, by ecclesiastical writers, it came, at length, with the more judicious, to acquire a meaning more precise and fixed. Firmilian calls Noah's ark the sacrament of the church of Christ¹⁶. It is manifest, from the illustration he subjoins, that he means the symbol, type, or emblem, of the church; alluding to an expression of the Apostle Peter¹⁷. This may, on a superficial view, be thought nearly coincident with the second sense of the word *μυστηριον*, above

¹⁵ Gal. iv. 22, &c.

¹⁶ Cyp. Epist. 75. in some editions 43.

¹⁷ 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21.

assigned. But, in fact, it is rather an inversion of it. It is not, in Scripture-language, the type that is called the *mystery*, but the antitype; not the sign, in any figurative speech or action, but the thing signified. It would, therefore, have corresponded better to the import of the Greek word, to say, "The church of Christ is the sacrament of "Noah's ark;" το μυστηριον, the secret antitype, which that vessel, destined for the salvation of the chosen few, from the deluge, was intended to adumbrate. This use, however, not uncommon among the fathers of the third century, has given rise to the definition of a sacrament, as *the visible sign of an invisible grace*; a definition to which some regard has been paid by most parties, Protestant as well as Romish.

§ 9. But to return to μυστηριον: it is plain that the earliest perversion of this word, from its genuine and original sense (a *secret*, or something concealed,) was in making it to denote some solemn and sacred ceremony. Nor is it difficult to point out the causes that would naturally bring ecclesiastic writers to employ it in a sense, which has so close an affinity to a common application of the word in profane authors. Among the different ceremonies employed by the heathen, in their idolatrous superstitions, some were public and performed in the open courts, or in those parts of the temples to which all had access; others were more secretly performed in places from which the crowd was carefully excluded. To assist, or even be present at these, a select

number only was admitted, to each of whom a formal and solemn initiation was necessary. These secret rites, on account of this very circumstance, their secrecy, were generally denominated *mysteries*. They were different, according to what was thought agreeable to the different deities, in whose honour they were celebrated. Thus they had the mysteries of Ceres, the mysteries of Proserpine, the mysteries of Bacchus, &c. Now there were some things in the Christian worship, which, though essentially different from all Pagan rites, had as much resemblance, in this circumstance, the exclusion of the multitude, as would give sufficient handle to the heathen to style them the Christian mysteries.

§ 10. PROBABLY the term would be first applied only to what was called in the primitive church, *the eucharist*, which we call *the Lord's supper*; and afterwards extended to *baptism* and other sacred ceremonies. In regard to the first-mentioned ordinance, it cannot be denied, that in the article of concealment, there was a pretty close analogy. Not only were all infidels, both Jews and Gentiles, excluded from witnessing the commemoration of the death of Christ; but even many believers, particularly the catechumens and the penitents; the former, because not yet initiated by baptism into the church; the latter, because not yet restored to the communion of Christians, after having fallen into some scandalous sin. Besides, the secrecy that Christians were often, on account of the persecutions to

which they were exposed, obliged to observe, which made them meet for social worship in the night time, or very early in the morning, would naturally draw on their ceremonies, from the Gentiles, the name of *mysterics*. And it is not unreasonable to think, that a name which had its rise among their enemies, might afterwards be adopted by themselves. The name *Christians*, first used at Antioch, seems, from the manner wherein it is mentioned in the Acts¹⁸, to have been at first given contemptuously to the disciples by infidels, and not assumed by themselves. The common titles by which, for many years after that period, they continued to distinguish those of their own society, as we learn both from the Acts, and from Paul's Epistles, were *the faithful*, or *believers*, *the disciples*, and *the brethren*. Yet, before the expiration of the apostolic age, they adopted the name *Christian*, and gloried in it. The Apostle Peter uses it in one place¹⁹, the only place in Scripture wherein it is used by one of themselves. Some other words and phrases which became fashionable amongst ecclesiastic writers, might naturally enough be accounted for in the same manner.

§ 11. BUT how the Greek *μυστηριον* came first to be translated into Latin *sacramentum*, it is not easy to conjecture. None of the classical significations of the Latin word seems to have any affinity to the Greek term. For whether we

¹⁸ Acts, xi. 26.

¹⁹ 1 Pet. iv. 16.

understand it simply for a sacred ceremony, *sacramentum* from *sacrare*, as *juramentum* from *jurare*, or for the pledge deposited by the litigants in a process, to ensure obedience to the award of the judge, or for the military oath of fidelity, none of these conveys to us either of the senses of the word *μυστηριον* explained above. At the same time it is not denied that, in the classical import, the Latin word may admit an allusive application to the more solemn ordinances of religion, as implying, in the participants, a sacred engagement equivalent to an oath. All that I here contend for is, that the Latin word *sacramentum* does not, in any of these senses, convey exactly the meaning of the Greek name *μυστηριον*, whose place it occupies in the Vulgate. Houbigant, a Romish priest, has, in his Latin translation of the Old Testament, used neither *sacramentum* nor *mysterium*; but where either of these terms had been employed in the Vulgate, he substitutes *secretum*, *arcantum*, or *absconditum*. Erasmus, though he wrote at an earlier period, has only once admitted *sacramentum* into his version of the New Testament, and said, with the Vulgate, *sacramentum septem stellarum*.

Now, it is to this practice, not easily accounted for, in the old Latin translators, that we owe the ecclesiastical term *sacrament*, which, though properly not scriptural, even Protestants have not thought fit to reject: they have only confined it a little in the application, using it solely of the two primary institutions of the Gospel, *baptism*

and *the Lord's Supper* ; whereas the Romanists apply it also to five other ceremonies, in all seven. Yet, even this application is not of equal latitude with that wherein it is used in the Vulgate. The sacrament of God's will²⁰, the sacrament of piety²¹, the sacrament of a dream²², the sacrament of the seven stars²³, and the sacrament of the woman²⁴, are phrases which sound very strangely in our ears.

§ 12. So much for the introduction of the term *sacrament* into the Christian theology, which (however convenient it may be for expressing some important rites of our religion,) has, in none of the places where it occurs in the Vulgate, a reference to any rite or ceremony whatever, but is always the version of the Greek word *μυστηριον*, or the corresponding term in Hebrew or Chaldee. Now the term *μυστηριον*, as has been shown, is always predicated of some doctrine, or of some matter of fact, wherein it is the intention of the writer to denote that the information he gives either was a secret formerly, or is the latent meaning of some type, allegory, figurative description, dream, vision, or fact referred to. No religion abounded more in pompous rites and ordinances than the Jewish, yet they are never, in Scripture, (any more than the ceremonies of the New Testament) denominated either mysteries or

²⁰ Eph. i. 9.

²¹ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

²² Dan. ii. 18. 30. 47.

²³ Rev. i. 20.

²⁴ Rev. xvii. 7.

sacraments. Indeed with us Protestants, the meanings in present use assigned to these two words, are so totally distinct, the one relating solely to doctrine, the other solely to positive institutions, that it may look a little oddly to bring them together, in the discussion of the same critical question. But to those who are acquainted with Christian antiquity, and foreign use in these matters, or have been accustomed to the Vulgate translation, there will be no occasion for an apology.

§ 13. BEFORE I finish this topic, it is proper to take notice of one passage wherein the word *μυστηριον*, it may be plausibly urged, must have the same sense with that which present use gives to the English word *mystery*, and denotes something which, though revealed, is inexplicable, and, to human faculties, unintelligible. The words are, *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness : God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory*²⁵. I do not here inquire into the justness of this reading, though differing from that of the two most ancient versions, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and some of the oldest manuscripts. The words, as they stand, sufficiently answer my purpose. Admit then that some of the great articles enumerated may be justly called mysteries, in the ecclesiastical and present acceptance of the term ;

²⁵ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

it does not follow that this is the sense of the term here. When a word in a sentence of holy writ is susceptible of two interpretations, so that the sentence, whichever of the two ways the word be interpreted, conveys a distinct meaning suitable to the scope of the place; and when one of these interpretations expresses the common import of the word in holy writ, and the other assigns it a meaning which it plainly has not in any other passage of Scripture, the rules of criticism manifestly require that we recur to the common acceptance of the term. Nothing can vindicate us in giving it a singular, or even a very uncommon, signification, but that all the more usual meanings would make the sentence involve some absurdity or nonsense. This is not the case here. The purport of the sentence plainly is, "Great unquestionably is the divine secret, of which our religion brings the discovery; God was manifest in the flesh, &c."

PART II.

OF BLASPHEMY.

I PROPOSED, in the second place, to offer a few thoughts on the import of the word *βλασφημία*, frequently translated *blasphemy*. I am far from affirming that in the present use of the English word, there is such a departure from the import

of the original, as in that remarked in the preceding article, between *μυστηριον*, and *mystery*: at the same time it is proper to observe, that in most cases there is not a perfect coincidence. *Βλασφημια* properly denotes *calumny, detraction, reproachful or abusive language*, against whomsoever it be vented. There does not seem, therefore, to have been any necessity for adopting the Greek word into our language, one or other of the English expressions above mentioned, being, in every case, sufficient for conveying the sense. Here, as in other instances, we have, with other moderns, implicitly followed the Latins, who had in this no more occasion than we, for a phraseology, not originally of their own growth. To have uniformly translated, and not transferred, the words *βλασφημια* and *βλασφημειν*, would have both contributed to perspicuity, and tended to detect the abuse of the terms when wrested from their proper meaning. That *βλασφημια* and its conjugates are in the New Testament very often applied to reproaches not aimed against God, is evident from the passages referred to in the margin²⁶; in the much greater part of which the English translators, sensible that they could admit no such application, have not used the words *blaspheme* or *blasphemy*, but *rail, revile, speak evil, &c.* In one of the passages quoted, a reproach-

²⁶ Matth. xii. 31, 32. xxvii. 39. Mark, xv. 29. Luke, xxii. 65. xxiii. 39. Rom. iii. 8. xiv. 16. 1 Cor. iv. 13. x. 30. Eph. iv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 4. 14. Jude, 9, 10. Acts, vi. 11. 13. 2 Pet. ii. 10, 11.

ful charge brought even against the devil, is called *κρισις βλασφημιας*²⁷, and rendered by them *railing accusation*. That the word in some other places²⁸ ought to have been rendered in the same general terms, I shall afterwards show. But with respect to the principal point, that the word comprehends all verbal abuse, against whomsoever uttered, God, angel, man, or devil; as it is universally admitted by the learned, it would be losing time to attempt to prove. The passages referred to will be more than sufficient to all who can read them in the original Greek.

§ 2. BUT it deserves our notice, and it is principally for this reason, that I judged it proper to make some remarks on the word, that even when *βλασφημια* refers to reproachful speeches against God, and so comes nearer the meaning of our word *blasphemy*; still the primitive notion of this crime has undergone a considerable change in our way of conceiving it. The causes it would not perhaps be difficult to investigate, but the effect is undeniable. In theological disputes nothing is more common, to the great scandal of the Christian name, than the imputation of blasphemy thrown by each side upon the other. The injustice of the charge, on both sides, will be manifest on a little reflection, which it is the more necessary to bestow, as the commonness of the accusation, and the latent, but contagious, motives of

²⁷ Jude, 9.

²⁸ Acts, xiii. 45. xviii. 6. xxvi. 11. Col. iii. 8. 1 Tim. i. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 2.

employing it, have gradually perverted our conceptions of the thing.

§ 3. It has been remarked already, that the import of the word *βλασφημία* is *maledicentia*, in the largest acceptation, comprehending all sorts of verbal abuse, imprecation, reviling, and calumny. Now let it be observed, that when such abuse is mentioned as uttered against God, there is properly no change made in the signification of the word; the change is only in the application, that is, in the reference to a different object. The idea conveyed in the explanation now given is always included, against whomsoever the crime be committed. In this manner every term is understood that is applicable to both God and man. Thus the meaning of the word *disobey* is the same, whether we speak of disobeying God or of disobeying man. The same may be said of *believe*, *honour*, *fear*, &c. As therefore the sense of the term is the same, though differently applied, what is essential to constitute the crime of detraction in the one case, is essential also in the other. But it is essential to this crime as commonly understood, when committed by one man against another, that there be in the injurious person the will or disposition to detract from the person abused. Mere mistake in regard to character, especially when the mistake is not conceived by him who entertains it to lessen the character, nay, is supposed, however erroneously, to exalt it, is never construed by any into the crime of defamation. Now, as blasphemy is, in

its essence, the same crime, but immensely aggravated, by being committed against an object infinitely superior to man, what is fundamental to the existence of the crime, will be found in this, as in every other species, which comes under the general name. There can be no blasphemy, therefore, where there is not an impious purpose to derogate from the divine majesty, and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God.

§ 4. HENCE, we must be sensible of the injustice of so frequently using the odious epithet *blasphemous* in our controversial writings; an evil imputable solely to the malignity of temper, which a habit of such disputation rarely fails to produce. Hence it is, that the Arminian and the Calvinist, the Arian and the Athanasian, the Protestant and the Papist, the Jesuit and the Jansenist, throw and retort on each other the unchristian reproach. Yet it is no more than justice to say, that each of the disputants is so far from intending to diminish, in the opinion of others, the honour of the Almighty, that he is, on the contrary, fully convinced, that his own principles are better adapted to raise it than those of his antagonist, and, for that very reason, he is so strenuous in maintaining them. But to blacken, as much as possible, the designs of an adversary, in order the more effectually to render his opinions hateful, is one of the many common, but detestable resources of theological controvertists. It is to be hoped that the sense, not only of the injustice of this

measure, but of its inefficacy for producing conviction in the mind of a reasonable antagonist, and of the bad impression it tends to make on the impartial and judicious, in regard both to the arguers and to the argument, will at length induce men to adopt more candid methods of managing their disputes ; and even, when provoked by the calumnious and angry epithets of an opposer, not to think of retaliating ; but to remember, that they will derive more honour from imitating, as is their duty, the conduct of Him who, when he was reviled, reviled not again.

§ 5. BUT, after observing that this perversion of the word *blasphemy* results, for the most part, from the intemperate heat and violence with which polemic writers manage their religious contests ; it is no more than doing justice to theologians and ecclesiastics (though it may look like a digression,) to remark, that this evidence of undue acrimony is by no means peculiar to them. So uncontrollable is this propensity in men of violent passions, that even sceptics cannot pretend an entire exemption from it. Some allowances ought doubtless to be made for the rage of bigots, inflamed by contradiction, from the infinite consequence they always ascribe to their own religious dogmas ; but when a reasoner, an inquirer into truth, and, consequently, a dispassionate and unprejudiced person (and doubtless such a man Lord Bolingbroke chose to be accounted,) falls into the same absurdity, adopts the furious language

of fanaticism, and rails against those whose theory he combats, calling them *impious blasphemers*, to what allowance can we justly think him entitled? I know of none, except our pity; to which, indeed, a manner, so much beneath the dignity of the philosopher, and unbecoming the patience and self-command implied in cool inquiry, seems to give him a reasonable claim. Since, however, with this defect of discernment, candour, and moderation, philosophers as well as zealots, infidels as well as fanatics, and men of the world as well as priests, are sometimes chargeable, it may not be unreasonable to bestow a few reflections on it.

§ 6. FIRST, to recur to analogy, and the reason of the thing: I believe there are few who have not sometimes had occasion to hear a man warmly, and with the very best intentions, commend another, for an action which in reality merited not praise but blame. Yet no man would call the person who, through simplicity, acted this part, a slanderer; whether the fact he related of his friend were true or false; since he seriously meant to raise esteem of him: for an intention to depreciate, is essential to the idea of slander. To praise injudiciously, is one thing; to slander, is another. The former, perhaps, will do as much hurt to the character, which is the subject of it, as the latter: but the merit of human actions depends entirely on the motive. There is a maliciousness in the calumniator, which no person who reflects, is in danger of confounding with

the unconscious blundering of a man, whose praise detracts from the person whom he means to honour. The blasphemer is no other than the calumniator of Almighty God. To constitute the crime, it is as necessary that this species of calumny be intentional, as that the other be. He must be one, therefore, who, by his impious talk, endeavours to inspire others with the same irreverence towards the Deity, or, perhaps, abhorrence, of him, which he indulges in himself. And though, for the honour of human nature, it is to be hoped, that very few arrive at this enormous guilt, it ought not to be dissembled, that the habitual profanation of the name and attributes of God, by common swearing, is but too manifest an approach towards it. There is not an entire coincidence. The latter of these vices may be considered as resulting solely from the defect of what is good in principle and disposition; the former, from the acquisition of what is evil in the extreme: but there is a close connection between them, and an insensible gradation from the one to the other. To accustom one's self to treat the Sovereign of the universe with irreverent familiarity, is the first step; malignly to arraign his attributes, and revile his providence, is the last.

§ 7. BUT it may be said, that an inquiry into the proper notion of *βλασφημία*, in the sacred writings, is purely a matter of criticism, concerning the import of a word, whose signification must be ultimately determined by scriptural use. Our

reasonings, therefore, are of no validity, unless they are supported by fact. True: but it ought to be considered, on the other hand, that as the word *βλασφημειν*, when men are the objects, is manifestly used for intentional abuse, the presumption is, that the signification is the same, when God is the object. Nay, according to the rules of criticism, it is evidence sufficient, unless a positive proof could be brought, that the word, in this application, undergoes a change of meaning. In the present instance, however, it is unnecessary to recur to the presumption, as positive testimony can be produced, that both the verb and the noun have the same meaning in these different applications.

§ 8. LET it be observed, then, that sometimes, in the same sentence, the word is applied in common both to divine and to human beings, which are specified as the objects, and construed with it, and sometimes the word, having been applied to one of these, is repeated, in an application to the other; the sacred writers thereby showing, that the evil is the same in kind in both cases, and that the cases are discriminated solely by the dignity of the object. Thus our Lord says (as in the common translation,) *All manner of blasphemy, πασα βλασφημια, shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven*²⁹. The difference in point

²⁹ Matth. xii. 31. See the passage in this translation, and the note upon it.

of atrociousness is here exceedingly great, the one being represented as unpardonable, and the other as what may be pardoned; but this is exhibited as resulting purely from the infinite disparity of the objects. The application of the same name to the two crimes compared, gives us to understand the immense disproportion there is, in respect of guilt, between the same criminal behaviour, when aimed against our fellow-creatures, and when directed against the Author of our being. As the English word *blasphemy* is not of the same extent of signification with the Greek, and is not properly applied to any abuse vented against man, it would have been better here to have chosen a common term which would have admitted equally an application to either, such as *reproach* or *detraction*. The expression of the Evangelist Mark, in the parallel place³⁰, is to the same purpose. Again, in the Acts, *We have heard him speak blasphemous words, ῥηματα βλασφημια, against Moses, and against God*³¹. Like to this is that passage in the Old Testament, where the false witnesses who were suborned to testify against Naboth say, *Thou didst blaspheme God and the king*³². Though the word in the Septuagint is not *βλασφημειν*, it is a term which, in that version, is sometimes used synonymously, as indeed are all the terms which in the original denote *cursing, reviling, defaming*.

³⁰ Mark, iii. 28, 29.

³¹ Acts, vi. 11.

³² 1 Kings, xxi. 10.

§ 9. FURTHER, with the account given above, of the nature of *blasphemy*, the style of Scripture perfectly agrees. No errors concerning the divine perfections can be grosser than those of polytheists and idolaters, such as the ancient pagans. Errors on this, if on any subject, are surely fundamental. Yet those errors are never in holy writ brought under the denomination of blasphemy: nor are those who maintain them ever styled blasphemers. Nay, among those who are no idolaters, but acknowledge the unity and spirituality of the divine nature (as did all the Jewish sects,) it is not sufficient to constitute this crime, that a man's opinions be, in their consequences, derogatory from the divine majesty, if they be not perceived to be so by him who holds them, and broached on purpose to diminish men's veneration of God. The opinions of the Sadducees appear in effect to have detracted from the justice, the goodness, and even the power of the Deity, as their tendency was but too manifestly to diminish in men the fear of God, and consequently to weaken their obligations to obey him. Yet neither our Saviour, nor any of the inspired writers, calls them *blasphemous*, as those opinions did not appear to themselves to detract, nor were advanced with the intention of detracting, from the honour of God. Our Lord only said to the Sadducees, *Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God*³³. Nay, it does not appear

³³ Matth. xxii. 19.

that even their adversaries the Pharisees, though the first who seem to have perverted the word (as shall be remarked afterwards,) and though immoderately attached to their own tenets, ever reproached them as blasphemers, on account of their erroneous opinions. Nor is indeed the epithet *blasphemous*, or any synonymous term, ever coupled in Scripture (as is common in modern use) with *doctrines, thoughts, opinions*. It is never applied but to words and speeches. *A blasphemous opinion*, or *blasphemous doctrine*, are phrases, which (how familiar soever to us) are as unsuitable to the scriptural idiom, as a *railing opinion*, or *slanderous doctrine*, is to ours.

§ 10. BUT to proceed from what is not, to what is, called *blasphemy* in Scripture: the first divine law published against it, *He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord* (or Jehovah, as it is in the Hebrew) *shall be put to death*³⁴, when considered, along with the incident that occasioned it, suggests a very atrocious offence in words, no less than abuse or imprecations, vented against the Deity. For, in what way soever the crime of the man there mentioned be interpreted, whether as committed against the true God, the God of Israel, or against any of the false gods whom his Egyptian father worshipped, the law in the words now quoted is sufficiently explicit; and the circumstances of the story plainly show that the

³⁴ Lev. xxiv. 15, 16.

words which he had used, were derogatory from the Godhead, and shocking to the hearers.

And, if we add to this, the only other memorable instance, in sacred history, namely, that of Rabshakeh, it will lead us to conclude, that it is solely a malignant attempt, in words, to lessen men's reverence of the true God, and by vilifying his perfections, to prevent their placing confidence in him, which is called in Scripture *blasphemy*, when the word is employed to denote a sin committed directly against God. This was manifestly the attempt of Rabshakeh when he said, *Neither let Hezekiah make you trust in the Lord* (the word is Jehovah,) *saying, Jehovah will surely deliver us. Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria? Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah? Have they delivered Samariah out of my hand? Who are they among all the gods of the countries, that have delivered their country out of mine hand, that Jehovah should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand*³⁵?

§ 11. **BLASPHEMY**, I acknowledge, like every other species of defamation, may proceed from ignorance combined with rashness and presumption; but it invariably implies (which is not implied in mere error) an expression of contempt or detestation, and a desire of producing the same

³⁵ 2 Kings, xviii. 30. 33, 34, 35.

passions in others. As this conduct, however, is more heinous in the knowing than in the ignorant, there are degrees of guilt even in blasphemy. God's name is said to be blasphemed among the heathen, through the scandalous conduct of his worshippers. And when Nathan said to David, *By this deed thou hast given occasion to the enemies of Jehovah to blaspheme*³⁶, his design was evidently to charge on that monarch, a considerable share of the guilt of those blasphemies to which his heinous transgression in the matter of Uriah, would give rise among their idolatrous neighbours: for here, as in other cases, the flagrant iniquity of the servant, rarely fails to bring reproach on the master, and on the service. It is, without doubt, a most flagitious kind of blasphemy whereof those men are guilty who, instead of being brought to repentance by the plagues wherewith God visits them for their sins, are fired with a monstrous kind of revenge against their Maker, which they vent in vain curses and impious reproaches. Thus, in the Apocalypse, we are informed of those who *blasphemed the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds*³⁷.

§ 12. It will perhaps be objected, that even the inspired penmen of the New Testament sometimes use the word with greater latitude than has here been given it. The Jews are said, by the sacred historian, *to have spoken against the things*

³⁶ 2 Sam. xii. 14.

³⁷ Rev. xvi. 11.

*preached by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming*³⁸. And it is said of others of the samê nation, *When they opposed themselves and blasphemed*³⁹. Now, as zeal for God and religion was the constant pretext of the Jews for vindicating their opposition to Christianity, it cannot be imagined they would have thrown out any thing like direct blasphemy or reproaches against God. It may, therefore, be plausibly urged, that it must have been (if we may borrow a term from the law) such constructive blasphemy, as when we call fundamental errors in things divine, by that odious name. But the answer is easy. It has been shown already, that the Greek word implies no more than to *revile, defame, or give abusive language*. As the term is general, and equally applicable, whether God be the object of the abuse, or man, it ought never to be rendered *blaspheme*, unless when the context manifestly restrains it to the former application. There is this advantage, if the case were dubious, in preserving the general term, that if God be meant as the object of their reproaches, still the version is just. In the story of the son of the Israelitish woman, the terms *cursing God*, and *blaspheming him*⁴⁰, are used synonymously; and, in regard to Rabshakeh's blasphemy, the phrases, *to reproach the living God or Jehovah*, and *to blaspheme him*⁴¹, are both used in the same way: but, on the other hand, if the writer

³⁸ Acts, xiii. 45.³⁹ xviii. 6.⁴⁰ Lev. xxiv. 11. 14.⁴¹ 2 Kings, xix. 4. 16. 22, 23.

meant abuse levelled against men, to render it *blaspheme* is a real mis-translation, inasmuch as, by representing the divine majesty as the object, which the English word *blaspheme* always does, the sense is totally altered.

Our translators have, on other occasions, been so sensible of this that, in none of the places marked in the margin⁴², have they used *blaspheme*, or any of its conjugates; but, instead of it, the words *rail, revile, report slanderously, speak evil, defame*, though the word in the original is the same; nay, in some places, where Jesus Christ is the object, they translate it in the same manner⁴³. There can be no doubt that, in the two passages quoted from the Acts, the Apostles themselves were the objects of the abuse which fiery zeal prompted their countrymen to throw out against the propagators of a doctrine, considered by them as subversive of the religion of their fathers. Both passages are justly rendered by Castalio: the first, *Judæi contradicebant iis quæ a Paulo dicebantur, reclamantes ac conviciantes*; the second, *Quumque illi resisterent ac maledicerent*.

§ 13. THE same will serve for answer to the objection founded on Paul's saying of himself before his conversion, that he was a *blasphemer*⁴⁴;

⁴² Rom. iii. 8. xiv. 6. 1 Cor. iv. 13. x. 30. Eph. iv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 4. 14. 2 Pet. ii. 10, 11. Jude, 9, 10.

⁴³ Matth. xxvii. 39. Mark, xv. 29. Luke, xxiii. 39.

⁴⁴ 1 Tim. i. 13.

the word ought to have been rendered *defamer*. Of this we can make no doubt, when we consider the honourable testimony which this Apostle, after his conversion, did not hesitate to give of his own piety when a Jew, *Brethren*, said he, *I have lived in all good conscience before God (rather towards God, τῷ Θεῷ, not ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ) until this day*⁴⁵. This expression, therefore, regards what is strictly called *duty to God*. But could he have made this declaration, if his conscience had charged him with blasphemy, of all crimes against God the most heinous? Should it be asked, In what sense could he charge himself with defamation? Whom did he defame? The answer is obvious. Not only the Lord Jesus Christ the head, but the members also of the Christian community, both ministers and disciples. Not that he considered himself as guilty of this crime by implication, for disbelieving that Jesus is the Messiah; for neither Jews nor Pagans are ever represented as either blasphemers or calumniators, merely for their unbelief; but because he was conscious that his zeal had carried him much further, even to exhibit the author of this institution as an impostor and false prophet, and his Apostles as his accomplices, in maliciously imposing upon the nation, and subverting the true religion. That he acted this part, the account given of his proceedings, not to mention this declaration, affords the most ample evidence. We are told that he breathed out threatenings and

⁴⁵ Acts, xxiii. 1.

slaughter against his disciples⁴⁶; and he says himself that he was exceedingly mad against them, and even compelled them to join in the abuse and reproaches⁴⁷, of which he accuses himself as setting the example. And though I doubt not that in this, Paul acted according to his judgment at the time; for he tells us expressly that he thought verily with himself that he *ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus⁴⁸; this ignorance did indeed extenuate his crime, but not excuse it; for it is not he only who invents, but he also who malignantly and rashly, or without examination and sufficient evidence, propagates an evil report against his neighbour, who is justly accounted a defamer.

Nor is the above-mentioned the only place wherein the word has been misinterpreted *blasphemer*. We have another example, in the character which the same Apostle gives of some seducers who were to appear in the church, and of whom he tells us, that they would *have a form of godliness, but without the power*⁴⁹. Now, blasphemy is alike incompatible with both; though experience has shown, in all ages, that slander and abuse, vented against men, however inconsistent with the power of godliness, are perfectly compatible with its form. Some other places in the New Testament, in which the word ought to have been translated in its greatest latitude, that is, in the sense of defamation, or reviling in

⁴⁶ Acts, ix. 1.⁴⁷ Acts, xxvi. 11.⁴⁸ Acts, xxvi. 9.⁴⁹ 2 Tim. iii. 5.

general, are marked in the margin⁵⁰. Indeed, as was hinted before, it ought always to be so, unless where the scope of the passage limits it to that impious defamation, whereof the Deity is the object.

§ 14. I KNOW but one other argument that can be drawn from Scripture, in favour of what I call the controversial sense of the word *blasphemy*; that is, as applied to errors which, in their consequences, may be thought to derogate from the perfections or providence of God. In this way the Pharisees, oftener than once, employ the term against our Lord; and, if their authority were to us a sufficient warrant, I should admit this plea to be decisive. But the question of importance to us is, Have we the authority of any of the sacred writers for this application of the word? Did our Lord himself, or any of his Apostles, ever retort this charge upon the Pharisees? Yet it cannot be denied, that the doctrine then in vogue with them gave, in many things, if this had been a legitimate use of the term *blasphemy*, a fair handle for such recrimination. They made void, we are told, the commandment of God, to make room for their tradition⁵¹; and thus, in effect, set up their own authority, in opposition to that of their Creator. They disparaged the moral duties of the law, in order to exalt positive and ceremonial

⁵⁰ Matth. xii. 31. xv. 19. Mark, iii. 28, 29. vii. 22. Luke, xxii. 65. Col. iii. 8. James, ii. 7.

⁵¹ Matth. xv. 6. Mark, vii. 13.

observances⁵². Now, this cannot be done by the teachers of religion, without some misrepresentation of the moral attributes of the Lawgiver, whose character is thereby degraded, in the minds of the people. Yet there is, nowhere, the most distant insinuation given that, on any of these accounts, they were liable to the charge of blasphemy.

But no sooner did Jesus say to the paralytic, *Thy sins are forgiven thee*, than the Scribes laid hold of the expression. *This man blasphemeth*, said they: *Who can forgive sins but God*⁵³? Their plea was, it is an invasion of the prerogative of God. Grotius observes justly of this application of the term, *Dicitur hic βλασφημειν, non qui Deo maledicit, sed qui quod Dei est, sibi arrogat*. Such, undoubtedly, was their notion of the matter. But I do not see any warrant they had for thus extending the signification of the word. In the simple and primitive import of the name *blasphemer*, it could not be more perfectly defined in Latin, than by these three words, *qui Deo maledicit*; and, therefore, I cannot agree with the generality of expositors, who seem to think, that if Jesus had not been the Messiah, or authorized of God to declare to men the remission of their sins, the Scribes would have been right in their verdict. On the contrary, if one, unauthorized of Heaven, had said what our Lord is recorded to have said to the paralytic, he would not, in my

⁵² Matth. xxiii. 23. Luke, xi. 42.

⁵³ Matth. ix. 3. Mark, ii. 7.

opinion, have been liable to that accusation : he would have been chargeable with great presumption, I acknowledge ; and if he had been conscious that he had no authority, he would have been guilty of gross impiety ; but every species of impiety is not blasphemy. Let us call things by their proper names. If any of us usurp a privilege that belongs, exclusively, to another man, or, if we pretend to have his authority, when we have it not, our conduct is very criminal ; but nobody would confound this crime with *calumny*. No more can the other be termed *blasphemy*, especially when it results from misapprehension, and is unaccompanied with a malevolent intention, either to depreciate the character, or to defeat the purpose, of the Almighty. The false prophets, who knowingly told lies in the name of God, and pretended a commission from him, which they knew they had not, were liable to death ; but they are nowhere said to blaspheme, that is, to revile, or to defame, their Maker. Much less could it be said of those who told untruths through mistake, and without any design of detracting from God.

This polemic application of the term *blasphemy* must, therefore, have originated in the schools of the rabbies, and appears to have been, in the time of our Lord and his Apostles, in general vogue with the Scribes. Nay, which is exceedingly repugnant to the original import of the name, they even applied it to expressions which did not refer to persons, but to things. Thus, the historian, in

relating the charge brought against Stephen, acquaints us⁵⁴, that *they set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law* : an application of the word, perhaps -till then unexampl'd. But we need not wonder at this liberty, when we consider, that the perversion of the term answered for them a double purpose ; first, it afforded them one easy expedient for rendering a person, whom they disliked, odious to the people, amongst whom the very suspicion of blasphemy excited great abhorrence ; secondly, it increased their own jurisdiction. Blasphemy was a capital crime, the judgment whereof was in the sanhedrim, of whom the chief priests, and some of the Scribes, always made the principal part. The farther the import of the word was extended, the more cases it brought under their cognizance, and the more persons into their power. Hence it proceeded, that the word *blasphemy*, which originally meant a crime no less than maliciously reviling the Lord of the universe, was at length construed to imply the broaching of any tenet, or the expressing of any sentiment (with whatever view it was done,) which did not quadrate with the reigning doctrine. For that doctrine, being presupposed to be the infallible will of God, whatever opposed it was said, by implication, to revile its Author. Such will ever be the case, when the principles of human policy are grafted upon religion.

⁵⁴ Acts, vi. 13.

§ 15. WHEN we consider this, and remark, at the same time, with what plainness our Lord condemned, in many particulars, both the maxims, and the practice, of the Pharisees, we cannot be surprised that, on more occasions than one, that vindictive and envious sect traduced him to the people, as a person chargeable with this infernal guilt. Once, indeed, some of them proceeded so far as to *take up stones to stone him*⁵⁵: for that was the punishment which the law had awarded against blasphemers. But he thought proper then to elude their malice, and, by the answer he gave to their unmerited reproach, evidently showed that their application of the term was unscriptural⁵⁶. Those who, on other occasions, watched our Lord to entrap him in his words, seem to have had it principally in view to extract either blasphemy or treason from what he said. By the first, they could expose him to the fury of the populace, or, perhaps, subject him to the Jewish rulers; and, by the second, render him obnoxious to the Roman procurator. What use they made of both articles at last, is known to every body. Nor let it be imagined that, at his trial, the circumstance, apparently slight, of the high priest's rending his clothes, when he pronounced him a blasphemer, an example which must have been quickly followed by the whole sanhedrim, and all within hearing, was not a matter of the utmost consequence, for effecting their malicious

⁵⁵ John, x. 31. 33.

⁵⁶ John, x. 34, 35, 36.

purpose. We have reason to believe, that it contributed not a little, in working so wonderful a change in the multitude, and in bringing them to view the man with detestation, to whom so short while before they were almost ready to pay divine honours.

§ 16. BUT here it may be asked, ‘Can we not then say, with truth, of any of the false teachers, who have arisen in the church, that they vented blasphemies?’ To affirm that we cannot, would, I acknowledge, be to err in the opposite extreme. Justin Martyr says of Marcion⁵⁷, that he taught many to blaspheme the Maker of the world. Now, it is impossible to deny the justice of this charge, if we admit the truth of what Irenæus⁵⁸, and others, affirm concerning that bold heresiarch, to wit, that he maintained, that the Author of our being, the God of Israel, who gave the law by Moses, and spoke by the Prophets, is one who perpetrates injuries, and delights in war, is fickle in his opinions, and inconsistent with himself. If this representation of Marcion’s doctrine be just, who would not say that he reviled his Creator, and attempted to alienate from him the love and confidence of his creatures? The blasphemy of Rabshakeh was aimed only against the power of God; Marcion’s not so much against his power, as against his wisdom and his goodness. Both equally manifested an intention of subverting the faith and veneration of his worshippers. Now, it is only what can be called a direct attack, not such

⁵⁷ Apol. 2.

⁵⁸ Lib. i. c. 29.

as is made out by implication, upon the perfections of the Lord of the universe, and what clearly displays the intention of lessening men's reverence of him, that is blasphemy, in the meaning (I say not of the rabbies, or of the canonists, but) of the sacred code. In short, such false and injurious language, and only such, as, when applied to men, would be denominated *reviling, abusing, defaming*, is, when applied to God *blasphemy*. The same terms in the original tongues are used for both; and it would perhaps have been better, for preventing mistakes, that in modern tongues also, the same terms were employed. Indeed, if we can depend on the justness of the accounts which remain of the oldest sectaries, there were some who went greater lengths in this way than even Marcion.

§ 17. BEFORE I finish this topic, it will naturally occur to inquire, What that is, in particular, which our Lord denominates *blasphemy against the Holy Spirit*⁵⁹? It is foreign from my present purpose, to enter minutely into the discussion of this difficult question. Let it suffice here to observe, that this blasphemy is certainly not of the constructive kind, but direct, manifest, and malignant. First, it is mentioned as comprehended under the same genus with abuse against man, and contradistinguished only by the object. Secondly, it is further explained, by being called *speaking against*, in both cases. Ὁς ἀν εἶπη λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ

⁵⁹ Matth. xii. 31, 32. Mark, iii. 28, 29. Luke, xii. 10.

του ανθρωπου,—*Ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου.* The expressions are the same, in effect, in all the Evangelists who mention it, and imply such an opposition as is both intentional and malevolent. This cannot have been the case of all who disbelieved the mission of Jesus, and even decried his miracles; many of whom, we have reason to think, were afterwards converted by the Apostles. But it is not impossible, that it may have been the wretched case of some who, instigated by worldly ambition and avarice, have slandered what they knew to be the cause of God, and, against conviction, reviled his work as the operation of evil spirits.

§ 13. A LATE writer⁶⁰ more ingenious than judicious, has, after making some just remarks on this subject, proceeded so far as to maintain that there can be no such crime as *blasphemy*. His argument (by substituting *defamation* for blasphemy, *defame* for blaspheme, and *man* for God) serves equally to prove that there is no such crime as defamation, and stands thus: ‘Defamation
 ‘ presupposes malice; where there is malice, there
 ‘ is misapprehension. Now the person who, mis-
 ‘ apprehending another, defames him, does no
 ‘ more than put the *man’s* name,’ (I use the au-
 ‘ thor’s phraseology) ‘ to his own misapprehensions
 ‘ of him. This is so far from speaking evil of *the*
 ‘ *man*, that it is not speaking of him at all. It is
 ‘ only speaking evil of a wild idea, of a creature of

⁶⁰ Independent Whig, No. 55.

‘the imagination, and existing nowhere but there⁶¹.’ From this clear manner of reasoning, the following corollary, very comfortable to those whom the world has hitherto misnamed slanderers, may fairly be deduced. If you have a spite against any man, you may freely indulge your malevolence, in saying of him all the evil you can think of. That you cannot be justly charged with defamation, is demonstrable. If all that you say be true, he is not injured by you, and therefore you are no detractor. If the whole or part be false, what is false does not reach him. Your abuse in that case is levelled against an ideal being, a chimera to which you only affix his name (a mere trifle, for a name is but a sound,) but with which the man’s real character is not concerned. Therefore, when you have said the worst that malice and resentment can suggest, you are not chargeable with defamation, which was the point to be proved. Thus the argument of that volatile author goes further to emancipate men from all the restraints of reason and conscience than, I believe,

⁶¹ That the reader may be satisfied that I do not wrong this author, I shall annex, in his own words, part of his reasoning concerning blasphemy. “As it is a crime that implies malice against God, I am not able to conceive how any man can commit it. A man who knows God, cannot speak evil of him. And a man who knows him not, and reviles him, does therefore revile him, because he knows him not. He therefore puts the name of God to his own misapprehensions of God. This is so far from speaking evil of the Deity, that it is not speaking of the Deity at all. It is only speaking evil of a wild idea, of a creature of the imagination, and existing nowhere but there.”

he himself was aware. He only intended by it, as one would think, to release us from the fear of God; it is equally well calculated for freeing us from all regard to man. Are we from this to form an idea of the liberty, both sacred and civil, of which that author affected to be considered as the patron and friend; and of the deference he professes to entertain for the Scriptures and primitive Christianity? I hope not; for he is far from being at all times consistent with himself. Of the many evidences which might be brought of this charge, one is, that no man is readier than he to throw the imputation of blasphemy on those whose opinions differ from his own⁶².

⁶² In the dedication of the book to the lower house of convocation, the author advises them to clear themselves from the imputation of maintaining certain ungodly tenets, by exposing the *blasphemies* of those of their own body: in No. 23, we are told that false zeal talks *blasphemy* in the name of the Lord; in No. 24, that persecutors *blasphemously* pretend to be serving God; and in No. 27, that it is a kind of *blasphemy* to attempt to persuade people that God takes pleasure in vexing his creatures. More examples of the commission of this impracticable crime might be produced from that author, if necessary.

√ 42
—
35

PART III.

OF SCHISM.

THE next term I proposed to examine critically was *σχισμα*, *schism*. The Greek word frequently occurs in the New Testament, though it has only once been rendered *schism* by our translators. However, the frequency of the use among theologians has made it a kind of technical term in relation to ecclesiastical matters; and the way it has been bandied, as a term of ignominy, from sect to sect reciprocally, makes it a matter of some consequence to ascertain, if possible, the genuine meaning it bears in holy writ. In order to this, let us, abstracting alike from the uncandid representations of all zealous party-men, have recourse to the oracles of truth, the source of light and direction.

§ 2. As to the proper acceptation of the word *σχισμα*, when applied to objects merely material, there is no difference of sentiments amongst interpreters. Every one admits that it ought to be rendered *rent*, *breach*, or *separation*. In this sense it occurs in the Gospels, as where our Lord says, *No man putteth a piece of new cloth to an old garment: for that which is put in to fill it up,*

*taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse*⁶³. *Χειρον σχισμα γινεται*. The same phrase occurs in the parallel passage in Mark⁶⁴. From this sense it is transferred by metaphor to things incorporeal. Thus it is used once and again by the Evangelist John, to signify a difference in opinion expressed in words. Of the contest among the Jews, concerning Jesus, some maintaining that he was, others that he was not, the Messiah; the sacred historian says, *Σχισμα ουν εν τω οχλω εγενετο δι' αυτου*. *So there was a division among the people because of him*⁶⁵. Here, it is plain, the word is used in a sense perfectly indifferent; for, it was neither in the true opinion supported by one side, nor in the false opinion supported by the other, that the *schism* or division lay, but in the opposition of these two opinions. In this sense of the word, there would have been no *schism*, if they had been all of one opinion, whether it had been the true opinion, or the false. The word is used precisely in the same signification by this Apostle, in two other places of his Gospel marked in the margin⁶⁶.

§ 3. But it is not barely to a declared difference in judgment, that even the metaphorical use of the word is confined. As *breach* or *rupture* is the literal import of it in our language; wherever these words may be figuratively applied, the term

⁶³ Matth. ix. 16.

⁶⁴ Mark, ii. 21.

⁶⁵ John, vii. 43.

⁶⁶ John, ix. 16. x. 19.

σχίσμα seems likewise capable of an application. It invariably presupposes that among those things whereof it is affirmed, there subsisted an union formerly, and as invariably denotes that the union subsists no longer. In this manner the Apostle Paul uses the word, applying it to a particular church or Christian congregation. Thus he adjures the Corinthians by the name of the Lord Jesus, that there be no divisions or schisms among them⁶⁷, *ἵνα μὴ ἦ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα*; and in another place of the same Epistle⁶⁸, he tells them, *I hear that there are divisions or schisms among you, ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπαρχειν*. In order to obtain a proper idea of what is meant by a breach or schism in this application, we must form a just notion of that which constituted the union whereof the schism was a violation. Now the great and powerful cement which united the souls of Christians, was their mutual love. *Their hearts, in the emphatical language of holy writ, were knit together in love*⁶⁹. This had been declared by their Master to be the distinguishing badge of their profession. *By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another*⁷⁰. Their partaking of the same baptism, their professing the same faith, their enjoying the same promises, and their joining in the same religious service, formed a connection merely external and of little significance, unless, agreeably to the Apostle's expression⁷¹, it was rooted

⁶⁷ 1 Cor. i. 10. ⁶⁸ 1 Cor. xi. 18. ⁶⁹ Col. ii. 2.

⁷⁰ John, xiii. 35. ⁷¹ Eph. iii. 17.

and grounded in love. As this, therefore, is the great criterion of the Christian character, and the foundation of the Christian unity, whatever alienates the affections of Christians from one another, is manifestly subversive of both, and may consequently, with the greatest truth and energy, be denominated *schism*. It is not so much what makes an outward distinction or separation (though this also may in a lower degree be so denominated,) as what produces an alienation of the heart, which constitutes schism in the sense of the Apostle; for this strikes directly at the vitals of Christianity. Indeed both the evil and the danger of the former, that is, an external separation, is principally to be estimated from its influence upon the latter, that is, in producing an alienation of heart; for it is in the union of affection among Christians, that the spirit, the life, and the power, of religion, are principally placed.

§ 4. IT may be said, Does it not rather appear, from the passage first quoted, to denote such a breach of that visible unity in the outward order settled in their assemblies, as results from some jarring in their religious opinions, and by consequence in the expressions they adopted? This, I own, is what the words in immediate connection, considered by themselves, would naturally suggest. *I beseech you, brethren, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions (schisms) among you, and that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the*

*same judgment*⁷². It cannot be denied that a certain unanimity, or a declared assent to the great articles of the Christian profession, was necessary in every one, in order to his being admitted to, and kept in the communion of, the church. But then it must be allowed, on the other hand, that those articles were at that time, few, simple, and perspicuous. It is one of the many unhappy consequences of the disputes that have arisen in the church, and of the manner in which these have been managed, that such terms of communion have since been multiplied, in every part of the Christian world, and not a little perplexed with metaphysical subtleties, and scholastic quibbles. Whether this evil consequence was, in its nature, avoidable, or, if it was, in what manner it might have been avoided, are questions, though important, foreign to the present purpose. Certain it is, however, that several phrases used by the Apostles, in relation to this subject, such as *ἁμοφρονες, το αυτο φρονουντες*, and some others, commonly understood to mean unanimous in opinion, denote, more properly, coinciding in affection, concurring in love, desire, hatred, and aversion, agreeably to the common import of the verb *φρονειν* both in sacred authors and in profane, which is more strictly rendered *to savour, to relish*, than *to be of opinion*.

§ 5. FURTHER, let it be observed, that in matters whereby the essentials of the faith are not

⁷² 1 Cor. i. 10.

affected, much greater indulgence to diversity of opinion was given, in those pure and primitive times, than has been allowed since, when the externals, or the form of religion came to be raised on the ruins of the essentials, or the power, and a supposed correctness of judgment made of greater account than purity of heart. In the apostolic age, which may be styled the reign of charity, their mutual forbearance in regard to such differences, was at once an evidence, and an exercise, of this divine principle. *Him that is weak in the faith, says our Apostle, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that he may eat all things : another who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not ; and let not him who eateth not, judge him that eateth*⁷³. *One man esteemeth one day above another : another esteemeth every day alike. As to these disputable points, let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind*⁷⁴, and, as far as he himself is concerned, act according to his persuasion. But he does not permit even him who is in the right, to disturb his brother's peace, by such unimportant inquiries. *Hast thou faith ?* says he ; the knowledge and conviction of the truth on the point in question ? *Have it to thyself before God. Happy is he who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth*⁷⁵. And in another place, *Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus*

⁷³ Rom. xiv. 1, 2, 3.⁷⁴ Rom. xiv. 5.⁷⁵ Rom. xiv. 22.

*minded ; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing*⁷⁶. We are to remember, that as the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, so neither is it logical acuteness in distinction, or grammatical accuracy of expression ; but it is *righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men*⁷⁷.

§ 6. Now, if we inquire, by an examination of the context, into the nature of those differences among the Corinthians, to which Paul affixes the name *σχισματα*, nothing is more certain, than that no cause of difference is suggested, which has any the least relation to the doctrines of religion, or to any opinions that might be formed concerning them. The fault which he stigmatized with that odious appellation, consisted, then, solely in an undue attachment to particular persons, under whom, as chiefs or leaders, the people severally ranked themselves, and thus, without making separate communions, formed distinctions among themselves, to the manifest prejudice of the common bond of charity, classing themselves under different heads. *Now this I say, adds the Apostle, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ*⁷⁸. It deserves to be remarked, that of the

⁷⁶ Phil. iii. 15, 16.

⁷⁷ Rom. xiv. 17, 18.

⁷⁸ 1 Cor. i. 12.

differences among the Roman converts, concerning the observance of days, and the distinction of meats, which we should think more material, as they more nearly affect the justness of religious sentiments, and the purity of religious practice, the Apostle makes so little account, that he will not permit them to harass one another with such questions; but enjoins them to allow every one to follow his own judgment; at the same time that he is greatly alarmed at differences among the Corinthians, in which, as they result solely from particular attachments and personal esteem, neither the faith nor the practice of a Christian appears to have an immediate concern. But it was not without reason that he made this distinction. The hurt threatened by the latter was directly against that extensive love commanded by the Christian law; but not less truly, though more indirectly, against the Christian doctrine and manners. By attaching themselves strongly to human, and consequently fallible, teachers and guides, they weakened the tie which bound them to the only divine guide and teacher, the Messiah, and therefore to that also which bound them all one to another.

§ 7. WHAT it was that gave rise to such distinctions in the church of Corinth, we are not informed, nor is it material for us to know. From what follows in the Epistle, it is not improbable, that they might have thought it proper in this manner to range themselves, under those who had been the instruments of their conversion to Christianity, or perhaps, those by whom they had been

baptized, or for whom they had contracted a special veneration. It is evident, however, that these petty differences, as we should account them, had already begun to produce consequences unfriendly to the spirit of the Gospel; for it is in this point of view solely that the Apostle considers them, and not as having an immediate bad influence on its doctrine. Thus resuming the subject, he says, *Ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal*⁷⁹? Thus it is uncontrovertible, in the first place, that the accusation imports that the Corinthians, by their conduct, had given a wound to charity, and not that they had made any deviation from the faith; and in the second place, that, in the apostolical acceptation of the word, men may be schismatics, or guilty of schism, by such an alienation of affection from their brethren as violates the internal union subsisting in the hearts of Christians, though there be neither error in doctrine, nor separation from communion, and consequently no violation of external unity in ceremonies and worship. Faustus, a Manichean bishop in the fourth century (however remote from truth the leading principles of his party were on more important articles,) entertained sentiments on this subject entirely scriptural. "Schisma," says he, "nisi fallor, est eadem opinantem atque eodem ritu colentem quo cæteri,

⁷⁹ 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.

“solo congregationis delectari dissidio.” Faust.
l. xx. C. iii. ap. August.

§ 8. AFTER SO clear a proof of the import of the term, if it should be thought of consequence to allege in confirmation what must be acknowledged to be more indirect, you may consider the only other passage in which the term is used in the New Testament, and applied metaphorically to the human body. In the same Epistle, the Apostle having shown that the different spiritual gifts bestowed on Christians, rendered them mutually subservient, and made all, in their several ways, harmoniously contribute to the good of the Christian community, gives a beautiful illustration of this doctrine from the natural body, the different functions of whose members admirably conduce to the benefit and support of one another, and to the perfection and felicity of the whole. He concludes in these words: *God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked, that there should be no schism in the body, ἵνα μὴ ἦ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι, but that the members should have the same care one for another: and whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it*⁸⁰. It is obvious that the word *schism* is here employed to signify, not a separation from the body, such as is made by amputation or fracture, but such a defect in utility and congruity, as would destroy what he

⁸⁰ 1 Cor. xii. 24, 25, 26.

considers as the mutual sympathy of the members, and their care one of another.

~ § 9. As to the distinctions on this subject, which in after-times obtained among theologians, it is proper to remark, that error in doctrine was not supposed essential to the notion of schism; its distinguishing badge was made separation from communion in religious offices, insomuch that the words *schismatic* and *separatist*, have been accounted synonymous. By this, divines commonly discriminate *schism* from *heresy*, the essence of which last is represented as consisting in an erroneous opinion obstinately maintained, concerning some fundamental doctrine of Christianity; and that whether it be accompanied with separation in respect of the ordinances of religion, or not. We have now seen that the former definition does not quadrate with the application of the word in the New Testament, and that *schism*, in scriptural use, is one thing, and *schism*, in ecclesiastical use, another.

PART IV.

OF HERESY.

LET US NOW inquire, with the same freedom and impartiality, into the scriptural use of the other term. The Greek word *ἁιρεσις*, which properly imports no more than *election*, or *choice*, was commonly employed by the Hellenist Jews, in our Saviour's time, when the people were much divided in their religious sentiments, to denote, in general, any branch of the division, and was nearly equivalent to the English words, *class*, *party*, *sect*. The word was not, in its earliest acceptation, conceived to convey any reproach in it, since it was indifferently used, either of a party approved, or of one disapproved, by the writer. In this way it occurs several times in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is always (one single passage excepted) rendered *sect*. We hear alike of the sect of the Sadducees, *ἁιρεσις των Σαδδουκαιων*⁶¹, and of the sect of the Pharisees, *ἁιρεσις των Φαρισαιων*⁶². In both places the term is adopted by the historian purely for distinction's sake, without the least appearance of intention to convey either praise, or blame. Nay, on one occasion, Paul, in the defence he made for himself before king Agrippa,

⁶¹ Acts, v. 17.⁶² Acts, xv. 5.

where it was manifestly his intention to exalt the party to which he had belonged, and to give their system the preference to every other system of Judaism, both in soundness of doctrine, and purity of morals, expresses himself thus: *My manner of life, from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews, which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify: that after the most straitest sect of our religion, κατα την ακριβεστατην αἰρεσιν της ημετερας θρησκειας, I lived a Pharisee* ⁸³.

§ 2. THERE is only one passage in that history, wherein there is an appearance that something reproachful is meant to be conveyed under the name αἰρεσις. It is in the accusation of Paul, by the orator Tertullus, on the part of the Jews, before the governor Felix; where amongst other things, we have these words: *We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, πρωτοστατην τε της των Ναζωραιων αἰρεσεως* ⁸⁴. I should not, however, have imagined that any part of the obloquy lay in the application of the word last mentioned, if it had not been for the notice which the Apostle takes of it in his answer. *But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, ην λεγουσιν αἰρεσιν, so worship I the God of my fathers* ⁸⁵.

⁸³ Acts, xxvi. 4, 5.

⁸⁴ Acts, xxiv. 5.

⁸⁵ Acts, xxiv. 14.

§ 3. HERE, by the way, I must remark a great impropriety in the English translation, though in this, I acknowledge, it does but follow the Vulgate. The same word is rendered one way in the charge brought against the prisoner, and another way in his answer for himself. The consequence is that, though nothing can be more apposite than his reply, in this instance, as it stands in the original; yet nothing can appear more foreign than this passage, in the two versions above mentioned. The Apostle seems to defend himself against crimes, of which he is not accused. In both places, therefore, the word ought to have been translated in the same manner, whether *heresy* or *sect*. In my judgment, the last term is the only proper one; for the word *heresy*, in the modern acceptation, never suits the import of the original word, as used in Scripture. But, when one attends to the very critical circumstances of the Apostle at this time, the difficulty in accounting for his having considered it as a reproach to be denominated of a *sect*, disclaimed by the whole nation, instantly vanishes. Let it be remembered, first, that, since the Jews had fallen under the power of the Romans, their ancient national religion had not only received the sanction of the civil powers for the continuance of its establishment in Judea, but had obtained a toleration in other parts of the empire; secondly, that Paul is now pleading before a Roman governor, a Pagan, who could not well be supposed to know much of the Jewish doctrine, worship, or controversies; and that he had been arraigned

by the rulers of his own nation, as belonging to a turbulent and upstart sect : for in this way they considered the Christians, whom they reproachfully named Nazarenes. The natural consequence of this charge, with one who understood so little of their affairs as Felix, was to make him look upon the prisoner as an apostate from Judaism, and, therefore, as not entitled to be protected, or even tolerated, on the score of religion. Against a danger of this kind, it was of the utmost importance to our Apostle to defend himself.

§ 4. ACCORDINGLY, when he enters on this part of the charge, how solicitous is he to prove, that his belonging to that *sect*, did not imply any defection from the religion of his ancestors ; and thus to prevent any mistaken judgment, on this article of his arraignment, into which a heathen judge must have otherwise unavoidably fallen. His own words will, to the attentive, supersede all argument or illustration : *But this I confess to thee, that after the way which they call a sect, so worship I ; Whom ? No new divinity, but, on the contrary, the God of our fathers : he adds, in order the more effectually to remove every suspicion of apostacy, Believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets ; and having the same hope towards God, which they themselves also entertain, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust*⁸⁶. Nothing could have been more

⁸⁶ Acts, xxiv. 14, 15.

ridiculous, than for the Apostle seriously to defend his doctrine against the charge of heterodoxy, before an idolater and polytheist, who regarded both him and his accusers as superstitious fools, and consequently, as, in this respect, precisely on a footing; but it was entirely pertinent in him to evince, before a Roman magistrate, that his faith and mode of worship, however much traduced by his enemies, were neither essentially different from, nor any way subversive of, that religion which the senate and people of Rome had solemnly engaged to protect; and that therefore he was not to be treated as an apostate, as his adversaries, by that article of accusation, that he was of the sect of the Nazarenes, showed evidently that they desired he should. Thus the Apostle, with great address, refutes the charge of having revolted from the religious institutions of Moses, and, at the same time, is so far from disclaiming, that he glories in the name of a follower of Christ.

§ 5. THERE is only one other place, in this history, in which the word occurs, namely, where the Jews at Rome (for whom Paul had sent on his arrival,) speaking of the Christian society, address him in these words: *But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, περι μεν γαρ της αιρεσεως ταυτης, we know that it is everywhere spoken against*⁸⁷. There cannot be a question, here, of the propriety of rendering the

⁸⁷ Acts, xxviii. 22.

word *ἀιρεσις*, *sect*, a term of a middle nature, not necessarily implying either good or bad. For, as to the disposition wherein those Jews were at this time, it is plain, they did not think themselves qualified to pronounce either for or against it, till they should give Paul, who patronised it, a full hearing. This they were willing to do; and, therefore, only acquainted him, in general, that they found it to be a party that was universally decried. Thus, in the historical part of the New Testament, we find the word *ἀιρεσις* employed to denote *sect* or *party*, indiscriminately, whether good or bad. It has no necessary reference to opinions, true or false. Certain it is, that sects are commonly, not always, caused by difference in opinion, but the term is expressive of the effect only, not of the cause.

§ 6. IN order to prevent mistakes, I shall here further observe, that the word *sect*, among the Jews, was not, in its application, entirely coincident with the same term as applied by Christians to the subdivisions subsisting among themselves. We, if I mistake not, invariably use it of those who form separate communions, and do not associate with one another in religious worship and ceremonies. Thus we call Papists, Lutherans, Calvinists, different sects, not so much on account of their differences in opinion, as because they have established to themselves different fraternities, to which, in what regards public worship, they confine themselves, the several denomina-

tions above mentioned having no intercommunity with one another in sacred matters. High church and low church we call only parties, because they have not formed separate communions. Great and known differences in opinion, when followed by no external breach in the society, are not considered with us as constituting distinct sects, though their differences in opinion may give rise to mutual aversion. Now, in the Jewish sects (if we except the Samaritans,) there were no separate communities erected. The same temple, and the same synagogues, were attended alike by Pharisees and by Sadducees. Nay, there were often of both denominations in the Sanhedrim, and even in the priesthood.

Another difference was, that the name of the sect was not applied to all the people who adopted the same opinions, but solely to the men of eminence among them who were considered as the leaders and instructors of the party. The much greater part of the nation, nay, the whole populace, received implicitly the doctrine of the Pharisees, yet Josephus never styles the common people *Pharisees*, but only followers and admirers of the Pharisees. Nay, this distinction appears sufficiently from sacred writ. *The Scribes and Pharisees*, says our Lord⁸⁸, *sit in Moses' seat*. This could not have been said so generally, if any thing further had been meant by *Pharisees*, but the teachers and guides of the party. Again,

⁸⁸ Matth. xxiii. 2.

when the officers sent by the chief priests to apprehend our Lord, returned without bringing him, and excused themselves by saying, *Never man spake like this man* ; they were asked, *Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on him*⁸⁹ ? Now, in our way of using words, we should be apt to say, that all his adherents were of the Pharisees ; for the Pharisaical was the only popular doctrine. But it was not to the followers, but to the leaders, that the name of the sect was applied. Here, however, we must except the Essenes, who, as they all, of whatever rank originally, entered into a solemn engagement, whereby they confined themselves to a peculiar mode of life, which, in a great measure, secluded them from the rest of mankind, were considered almost in the same manner as we do the Benedictines or Dominicans, or any order of monks or friars among the Romanists.

Josephus in the account he has given of the Jewish sects, considers them all as parties who supported different systems of philosophy, and has been not a little censured for this, by some critics. But, as things were understood then, this manner of considering them was not unnatural. Theology, morality, and questions regarding the immortality of the soul, and a future state, were principal branches of their philosophy. “*Philosophia,*”

⁸⁹ John, vii. 48.

says Cicero⁹⁰, “nos primum ad deorum cultum, “ deinde ad jus hominum quod situm est in generis humani societate, tum ad modestiam, magnitudinemque animi erudit: eademque ab animo “ tanquam ab oculis, caliginem dispulit, ut omnia “ supera, infera, prima, ultima, media, videremus.” Besides, as it was only men of eminence qualified to guide and instruct the people, who were dignified with the title, either of Pharisee or of Sadducee, there was nothing so analogous among the Pagans, as their different sects of philosophers, the Stoics, the Academics, and the Epicureans, to whom also the general term *ἁιρεσεις* was commonly applied. Epiphanius, a Christian writer of the fourth century; from the same view of things with Josephus, reckons among the *ἁιρεσεις*, sects, or heresies, if you please to call them so, which arose among the Greeks, before the coming of Christ, these classes of philosophers, the Stoics, the Platonists, the Pythagoreans, and the Epicureans. Of this writer it may also be remarked, that in the first part of his work, he evidently uses the word *ἁιρεσεις* in all the latitude in which it had been employed by the sacred writers, as signifying sect or party of any kind, and without any note of censure. Otherwise he would never have numbered Judaism, whose origin he derives from the command which God gave to Abraham to circumcise all the males of his family, among the original heresies. Thus, in laying down the plan of his work, he says, *Εν τῷ οὖν πρώτῳ βιβλίῳ πρώτου το-*

⁹⁰ Tuscul. Quæst. lib. I.

μον ἄιρεσεις εἰκοσιν, ἅι εἰσιν ἄιδε, βαρβαρισμος, σκνθισμος, ελληρισμος, ιουδαισμος, κ. τ. ε.⁹¹ This only by the way.

§ 7. BUT, it may be asked, is not the acceptation of the word, in the Epistles, different from what it has been observed to be in the historical books of the New Testament? Is it not, in the former, invariably used in a bad sense, as denoting something wrong, and blameable? That in those, indeed, it always denotes something faulty, or even criminal, I am far from disputing: nevertheless, the acceptation is not materially different from that in which it always occurs in the Acts of the Apostles. In order to remove the apparent inconsistency in what has been now advanced, let it be observed, that the word *sect* has always something relative in it; and therefore, in different applications, though the general import of the term be the same, it will convey a favourable idea, or an unfavourable, according to the particular relation it bears. I explain myself by examples. The word *sect* may be used along with the proper name, purely by way of distinction from another party, of a different name; in which case the word is not understood to convey either praise or blame. Of this we have examples in the phrases above quoted, the sect of the Pharisees,

⁹¹ This import of the word *heresy* in Epiphanius has not escaped the observation of the author of *Dictionnaire Historique des auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, who says, “ Par le mot d’ hérésies, “ St. Epiphane entend une secte ou une société d’ hommes “ qui ont, sur la religion, des sentimens particuliers.”

the sect of the Sadducees, the sect of the Nazarenes. In this way we may speak of a strict sect, or a lax sect, or even of a good sect, or a bad sect. If any thing reprehensible or commendable be suggested, it is not suggested by the term sect, *ἀιρεσις*, but by the words construed with it. Again, it may be applied to a formed party in a community, considered in reference to the whole. If the community, of which the sect is a part, be of such a nature as not to admit this subdivision, without impairing and corrupting its constitution, to charge them with splitting into sects, or forming parties, is to charge them with corruption, in what is most essential to them as a society. Hence arises all the difference there is in the word, as used in the history, and as used in the Epistles of Peter and Paul; for these are the only Apostles who employ it. In the history, the reference is always of the first kind; in the Epistles, always of the second. In these, the Apostles address themselves only to Christians, and are not speaking of sects without the church, but either reprehending them for, or warning them against, forming sects among themselves, to the prejudice of charity, to the production of much mischief within their community, and of great scandal to the unconverted world without. So Paul's words to the Corinthians were understood by Chrysostom, and other ancient expositors. In both applications, however, the radical import of the word is the same.

§ 8. BUT even here, it has no necessary reference to doctrine, true or false. Let us attend to the first passage, in which it occurs in the Epistles, and we shall be fully satisfied of the truth of this remark. It follows one quoted in Part Third of this Dissertation. *For there must be also heresies among you*⁹². *Δει γαρ και αίρεσεις εν ύμιν είναι*. Ye must also have sects amongst you. It is plain, that what he reproves under the name *σχίσματα*, in the former verse, is in effect the same with what he here denominates *αίρεσεις*. Now, the term *σχίσμα*, I have shown already to have there no relation to any erroneous tenet, but solely to undue regards to some individual teachers, to the prejudice of others, and of the common cause. In another passage of this Epistle, where, speaking of the very same reprehensible conduct, he uses the words *strife and factions*, *ερις και διχοσταδαι*⁹³, words nearly coincident with *σχίσματα και αίρεσεις*; his whole aim in these reprehensions is well expressed in these words, *that ye might learn in us* (that is, in himself and Apollos, whom he had named, for example's sake,) *not to think of men above that which is written*, above what Scripture warrants, *that no one of you be puffed up for one, make your boast of one, against another*⁹⁴.

§ 9. IT may be said, Does not this explanation represent the two words *schism* and *heresy* as synonymous? That there is a great affinity in their

⁹² 1 Cor. xi. 19.⁹³ 1 Cor. iii. 3.⁹⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 6.

significations is manifest; but they are not convertible terms. I do not find that the word *σχίσμα* is ever applied in holy writ to a formed party, to which the word *ἁιρεσις* is commonly applied. I understand them in the Epistles of this Apostle, as expressive of different degrees of the same evil. An undue attachment to one part, and a consequent alienation of affection from another part, of the Christian community, comes under the denomination of *σχίσμα*. When this disposition has proceeded so far as to produce an actual party or faction among them, this effect is termed *ἁιρεσις*. And it has been remarked, that even this term was at that time currently applied, when matters had not come to an open rupture and separation, in point of communion. There was no appearance of this, at the time referred to, among the Corinthians. And even in Judaism, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, the two principal sects, nay, the only sects mentioned in the Gospel, and (which is still more extraordinary) more widely different in their religious sentiments than any two Christian sects, still joined together, as was but just now observed, in all the offices of religious service, and had neither different priests and ministers, nor separate places for social worship, the reading of the law, or the observance of the ordinances.

§ 10. IT will perhaps be said that, in the use at least which the Apostle Peter has made of this word, it must be understood to include some gross errors, subversive of the very foundations of the

faith. The words in the common version are, *But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction*⁹⁵. That the Apostle in this passage foretells that there will arise such *ἁιρεσεις*, sects or factions, as will be artfully and surreptitiously formed by teachers who will entertain such pernicious doctrines, is most certain; but there is not the least appearance that this last character was meant to be implied in the word *ἁιρεσεις*. So far from it, that this character is subjoined as additional information concerning, not the people seduced, or the party, but the seducing teachers; for it is of them only (though one would judge differently from our version) that what is contained in the latter part of the verse is affirmed. The words in the original are, *Ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσονται ψευδοδιδασκαλοι, οἱτινες παρεισαξουσιν ἁιρεσεις απωλειας και τον αγορασαντα αυτους δεσποτην αρνουμενοι, επαγοντες ἑαυτοις ταχινην απωλειαν*. Observe it is *αρνουμενοι* and *επαγοντες*, in the masculine gender and nominative case, agreeing with *ψευδοδιδασκαλοι*, not *αρνουμενας* and *επαγουσας* in the feminine gender and accusative case, agreeing with *ἁιρεσεις*. Again, if the word *ἁιρεσεις* did not imply the effect produced, sects, or factions, but the opinions taught, whether true or false, which are often, not always, the secret spring of division, he would probably have

⁹⁵ 2 Peter, ii. 1.

expressed himself in this manner, *ψευδοδιδασκαλοι οτινες διδαξουσι αιρεσεις απωλειας*, who will teach damnable, or rather destructive, heresies; for doctrine of every kind, sound and unsound, true and false, is properly said to be taught; but neither here, nor any where else in Scripture, I may safely add, nor in any of the writings of the two first centuries, do we ever find the word *αιρεσις* construed with *διδασκω*, *κηρυσσω*, or any word of like import, or an opinion, true or false, denominated *αιρεσις*. There are, therefore, two distinct and separate evils in those false teachers of which the Apostle here gives warning. One is, their making division, by forming to themselves sects or parties of adherents; the other is, the destructive principles they will entertain, and doubtless, as they find occasion, disseminate among their votaries.

§ 11. THE only other passage in which the word *αιρεσις* occurs in the New Testament, is where Paul numbers *αιρεσεις*, *sects*, among the works of the flesh⁹⁶, and very properly subjoins them to *διχοστασιαι*, factions, as the word ought to be rendered, according to the sense in which the Apostle always uses it. Such distinctions and divisions among themselves, he well knew, could not fail to alienate affection and infuse animosity. Hence we may learn to understand the admonition of the Apostle, *A man that is a heretic, αιρετικον ανθρωπον, after the first and second admonition reject,*

⁹⁶ Gal. v. 20.

knowing that he that is such, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself⁹⁷. It is plain, from the character here given, as well as from the genius of the language, that the word ἁιρετικος in this place does not mean a member of an ἁιρεσις or sect, who may be unconscious of any fault, and so is not equivalent to our word *sectary*; much less does it answer to the English word *heretic*, which always implies one who entertains opinions in religion not only erroneous, but pernicious; whereas we have shown that the word ἁιρεσις, in scriptural use, has no necessary connection with opinion at all. Its immediate connection is with division or dissension, as it is thereby that sects and parties are formed. ἁιρετικος ανθρωπος, must therefore mean one who is the founder of a sect, or at least has the disposition to create ἁιρεσεις, or sects, in the community, and may properly be rendered a *factious man*. This version perfectly coincides with the scope of the place, and suits the uniform import of the term ἁιρεσις, from which it is derived. The admonition here given to Titus is the same, though differently expressed, with what he had given to the Romans, when he said, *Mark them which cause divisions, διχοστασιας ποιουντας, make parties or factions, and avoid them*⁹⁸. As far down indeed as the fifth century, and even lower, error alone, however gross, was not considered as sufficient to warrant the charge of heresy. Malignity, or perverseness of disposition, was held essential to this crime. Hence the

⁹⁷ Tit. iii. 10, 11.

⁹⁸ Rom. xvi. 17.

famous adage of Augustine, "Errare possum, hæreticus esse nolo;" which plainly implies that no error in judgment, on any article, of what importance soever, can make a man a heretic, where there is not pravity of will. To this sentiment even the schoolmen have shown regard in their definitions. "Heresy," say they, "is an opinion maintained with obstinacy against the doctrine of the church." But if we examine a little their reasoning on the subject, we shall quickly find the qualifying phrase, *maintained with obstinacy*, to be mere words which add nothing to the sense: for if what they account the church have declared against the opinion, a man's obstinacy is concluded from barely maintaining the opinion, in what way soever he maintain it, or from what motives soever he be actuated. Thus mere mistake is made at length to incur the reproach originally levelled against an aspiring factious temper, which would sacrifice the dearest interests of society to its own ambition.

§ 12. I CANNOT omit taking notice here by the way, that the late Dr. Foster, an eminent English dissenting minister, in a sermon he preached on this subject, has, in my opinion, quite mistaken the import of the term. He had the discernment to discover that the characters annexed would not suit the common acceptation of the word *heretic*; yet he was so far misled by that acceptation, as to think that error in doctrine must be included as part of the description, and therefore defined a

heretic in the Apostle's sense, "a person who, to make himself considerable, propagates false and pernicious doctrine, knowing it to be such." Agreeably to this notion, the anonymous English translator renders with his usual freedom *ἁμαρτανει, ὡν αυτοκατακριτος*, *knows in his own conscience that his tenets are false*. To Foster's explanation there are insuperable objections. First, it is not agreeable to the rules of criticism, to assign, without any evidence from use, a meaning to a concrete term which does not suit the sense of the abstract. *ἄλγεσις* is the abstract, *ἄλγετικος* the concrete. If *ἄλγεσις* could be shown, in one single instance, to mean the profession and propagation of opinions not believed by him who professes and propagates them, I should admit that *ἄλγετικος* might denote the professor or propagator of such opinions. But it is not pretended that *ἄλγεσις* in any use, scriptural, classical, or ecclesiastical, ever bore that meaning: there is therefore a strong probability against the sense given by that author to the word *ἄλγετικος*. Secondly, this word, though it occurs but once in Scripture, is very common in ancient Christian writers; but has never been said, in any one of them, to bear the meaning which the Doctor has here fixed upon it. Thirdly, the apostolical precept, in this way, explained, is of little or no use. Who can know whether a man's belief in the opinions professed by him, be sincere or hypocritical? Titus, you may say, had the gift of discerning spirits, and therefore might know. Was, then, the precept after his lifetime, or, even, after the ceasing of miracu-

lous powers, to be of no service to the church? This I think incredible, especially as there is no other direction in the chapter, or even in the Epistle, which requires a supernatural gift to enable men to follow. To what purpose enjoin us to avoid a heretic, if it be impossible without a miracle to know him? In fine, though I would not say that such a species of hypocrisy as Foster makes essential to the character, has never appeared, I am persuaded it very rarely appears. It is the natural tendency of vanity and ambition to make a man exert himself in gaining proselytes to his own notions, however trifling, and however rashly taken up. But it is not a natural effect of this passion to be zealous in promoting opinions which the promoter does not believe, and to the propagation of which he has no previous inducement from interest. It is sufficient to vindicate the application of the term *αυτοκατακριτος*, or *self-condemned*, that a factious or turbulent temper, like any other vicious disposition, can never be attended with peace of mind, but, in spite of all the influence of self-deceit, which is not greater in regard to this than in regard to other vices, must, for the mortal wounds it gives to peace and love, often be disquieted by the stings of conscience. In short, the *ᾠρειτικος*, when that term is applied to a person professing Christianity, is the man who, either from pride, or from motives of ambition or interest, is led to violate these important precepts of our Lord, *Ἔμεις δε μη κληθητε ῥαββι. εἰς γαρ εστιν ἕμων ὁ διδασκαλος, ὁ Χριστος*

μηδε κληθητε καθηγηται 'εις γαρ υμων εστιν ο καθηγητης, ο Χριστος : which I render thus : *But as for you, assume not the title of rabbi ; for ye have only one teacher, the Messiah : neither assume the title of leaders, for ye have only one leader, the Messiah*⁹⁹.

§ 13. It deserves further to be remarked, that, in the early ages of the church, after the finishing of the canon, the word *αιρετικος* was not always limited (as the word *heretic* is in modern use) to those who, under some form or other, profess Christianity. We at present invariably distinguish the *heretic* from the *infidel*. The first is a corrupter of the Christian doctrine, of which he professes to be a believer and a friend ; the second a declared unbeliever of that doctrine, and consequently an enemy : whereas, in the times I speak of, the head of a faction in religion, or in ethics (for the term seems not to have been applied at first to the inferior members,) the founder, or at least the principal promoter of a sect or party, whether within or without the church ; that is, whether of those who called themselves the disciples of Christ, or of those who openly denied him, was indiscriminately termed *αιρετικος*.

The not attending to this difference in the ancient application of the word, has given rise to some blunders and apparent contradictions in ecclesiastic history ; in consequence of which, the early writers have been unjustly charged with

⁹⁹ Matth. xxiii. 8. 10

confusion and inconsistency in their accounts of things; when, in fact, the blunders imputed to them by more modern authors, have arisen solely from an ignorance of their language. We confine their words by an usage of our own, which, though it came gradually to obtain some ages afterwards, did not obtain in their time. Hence Dositheus, Simon Magus, Menander, and some others, are commonly ranked among the ancient heretics; though nothing can be more evident, from the accounts given by the most early writers who so denominate them, than that they were deniers of Jesus Christ in every sense, and avowed opposers to the Gospel. Dositheus gave himself out¹⁰⁰, to his countrymen, the Samaritans, for the Messiah promised by Moses. Simon Magus, as we learn from holy writ¹⁰¹, was baptized; but that, after the rebuke which he received from Peter, instead of repenting, he apostatized, the uniform voice of antiquity puts beyond a question. Origen says expressly¹⁰², “The Simonians by no means acknowledge Jesus to be the Son of God; on the contrary, they call Simon the power of God.” Accordingly, they were never confounded with the Christians, in the time of persecution, or involved with them in any trouble or danger¹⁰³. Justin Martyr is another evidence of the same thing¹⁰⁴; as is also Irenæus, in the account

¹⁰⁰ Orig. adv. Cels. lib. I.

¹⁰¹ Acts, viii. 13.

¹⁰² Ουδαμως τον Ιησουν ομολογουσι υιον Θεου Σιμωνιανοι, αλλα δυναμιν Θεου λεγουσι τον Σιμωνα. Orig. adv. Cels. lib. V.

¹⁰³ Orig. adv. Cels. lib. VI.

¹⁰⁴ Apol. 2^{da} Dialog. cum Tryphone.

which, in his treatise against heresies, he gives¹⁰⁵ of Simon and his disciple Menander. So is likewise Epiphanius. From them all it appears manifestly, that the above-named persons were so far from being, in any sense, followers of Jesus Christ, that they presumed to arrogate to themselves, his distinguishing titles and prerogatives, and might therefore be more justly called Antichrists than Christians. The like may be said of some other ancient sects which, through the same mistake of the import of the word, are commonly ranked among the heresies which arose in the church. Such were the *Ophites*, of whom Origen acquaints us, that they were so far from being Christians, that our Lord was reviled by them as much as by Celsus, and that they never admitted any one into their society, till he had vented curses against Jesus Christ¹⁰⁶.

Mosheim, sensible of the impropriety of classing the declared enemies of Christ among the *heretics*, as the word is now universally applied, and, at the same time, afraid of appearing to contradict the unanimous testimony of the three first centuries, acknowledges that they cannot be suitably ranked with those sectaries who sprang up within the church, and apologizes, merely from the example of some moderns who thought as he did, for his not considering those ancient party-

¹⁰⁵ Adv. Hæreses, lib. I. cap. xx. xxi.

¹⁰⁶ Οφιανοι καλουμενοι τοβουτον αποδουσι του ειναι Χριστιανοι, 'ωστε ουκ ελαττον Κελδου κατηγορειν αυτους του Ιησου. Και μη προτερον προσιεσθαι τινα επι το συνηδριον εαυτων, εαν μη αρασθηται κατα του Ιησου. Adver. Cels. lib. VI.

leaders in the same light wherein the early ecclesiastic authors, as he imagines, had considered them. But he has not said any thing to account for so glaring an inaccuracy, not of one or two, but of all the primitive writers who have taken notice of those sects. For even those who deny that they were Christians, call them *heretics* ¹⁰⁷. Now, I will take upon me to say, that though this,

107 “ Quotquot tribus prioribus sæculis SIMONIS Magi meminerunt, etsi hæreticorum eum familiam ducere jubent, per ea tamen quæ de eo referunt, hæreticorum ordine excludunt, et inter Christianæ religionis hostes collocant. ORIGENES Simonianos disertissime ex Christianis sectis exturbat, eosque non Iesum Christum, sed Simonem colere narrat. Cum hoc cæteri omnes, alii claris verbis, alii sententiis, quas SIMONI tribuunt, consentiunt: quæ quidem sententiæ ejus sunt generis, ut nulli convenient quam homini CHRISTO longissime se præferenti, et divini legati dignitatem sibimet ipsi arroganti. Hinc *Simoniani* etiam, quod ORIGENES et JUSTINUS MARTYR præter alios testantur, quum Christiani quotidianis periculis expositi essent, nullis molestiis et injuriis afficiebantur: CHRISTUM enim eos detestari, publice notum erat. Sic ego primus, nisi fallor, quum ante viginti annos de Simone sentirem, erant, quibus periculosum et nefas videbatur, tot sanctorum virorum, qui SIMONEM hæreticorum omnium patrem fecerunt, fidem in disceptationem vocare, tot sæculorum auctoritatem contemnerere. Verum sensim plures hæc sententia patronos, per ipsam evidentiam suam sibi acquisivit. Et non ita pridem tantum potuit apud Jos. AUGUSTINUM ORSI, quem summo cum applausu ipsius Pontificis Maximi Romæ *Historiam Ecclesiasticam* Italico sermone scribere notum est, ut eam approbaret.” *Moshemius. De Rebus Christianis ante Constantinum Magnum Commentarii.* Sæculum primum, § lxxv. No. 3. The words in the text, to which the preceding note refers, are, “ Toti hæreticorum agmini, maxime cohorti gnosticæ, omnes veteris ecclesiæ doctores præponunt SIMONEM MAGUM.—Omnia quæ de

in one single writer, might be the effect of oversight, it is morally impossible that, in so many, it should be accounted for otherwise than by supposing that their sense of the word *αἰρετικός* did not coincide with ours; and that it was therefore no blunder in them, that they did not employ their words according to an usage which came to be established long after their time. I am indeed surprised, that a man of Mosheim's critical sagacity, as well as profound knowledge of Christian antiquity, did not perceive that this was the only reasonable solution of the matter. But what might sometimes be thought the most obvious truth, is not always the first taken notice of. Now, I cannot help considering the easy manner in which this account removes the difficulty, as no small evidence of the explanation of the word in scriptural use, which has been given above. To observe the gradual alterations which arise in the meanings of words, as it is a point of some nicety, is also of great consequence in criticism; and often proves a powerful means both of fixing the date of genuine writings, and of detecting the supposititious.

§ 14. I SHALL observe, in passing, that the want of due attention to this circumstance has, in another

“SIMONE memoriae ipsi prodiderunt, manifestum faciunt, eum
 “non in corruptorum religionis Christianae, id est, hæreticorum,
 “sed infensissimorum ejus hostium numero ponendum esse,
 “qui et ipsum CHRISTUM maledictis insectabatur, et progredienti
 “rei Christianae quæ poterat, impedimenta objiciebat.”

er instance, greatly contributed to several errors, in relation to Christian antiquities, and particularly, to the multiplication of the primitive martyrs, far beyond the limits of probability. The Greek word *μαρτυρ*, though signifying no more, originally, than *witness*, in which sense it is always used in the New Testament, came, by degrees, in ecclesiastical use, to be considerably restrained in its signification. The phrase *οι μαρτυρες του Ιησου*, *the witnesses of Jesus*, was, at first, in the church, applied, by way of eminence, only to the Apostles. The reality of this application, as well as the grounds of it, we learn from the Acts¹⁰⁸. Afterwards, it was extended to include all those who, for their public testimony to the truth of Christianity, especially when emitted before magistrates and judges, were sufferers in the cause, whether by death or by banishment, or in any other way. Lastly, the name *martyr* (for then the word was adopted into other languages) became appropriated to those who suffered death in consequence of their testimony: the term *ομολογητης*, *confessor*, being, for distinction's sake, assigned to those witnesses who, though they suffered in their persons, liberty, or goods, did not lose their lives in the cause. Now, several later writers, in interpreting the ancients, have been misled by the

¹⁰⁸ Acts, i. 8. 22. ii. 32. iii. 15. v. 32. x. 39. xxii. 15. xxvi. 16. The last two passages quoted relate to Paul, who, by being designed of God *a witness of the Lord Jesus to all men*, was understood to be received into the apostleship, and into the society of the twelve.

usage of their own time; and have understood them as speaking of those who died for the name of Jesus, when they spoke only of those who openly attested his miracles and mission, agreeably to the primitive and simple meaning of the word *μαρτυρ*. Of this Mosheim has justly taken notice in the work above quoted. I have here only observed it, by the way, for the sake of illustration; for, as to the sense wherein the word is used in the New Testament, no doubt seems ever to have arisen ¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁹ “ Ipsa vocabuli *martyr* ambiguitas apud hominēs imperitos voluntatem gignere potuit fabulas de tragico eorum [apostolorum] exitu cogitandi. *Martyr* Græcorum sermone quemlibet *testem* significat. Sacro verò Christianorum sermone idem nomen eminentiore sensu *testem* CHRISTI sive hominem designat, qui moriendo testari voluit, spem omnem suam in CHRISTO positam esse. Priori sensu apostoli ab ipso CHRISTO *μαρτυρες* nominantur, et ipsi eodem vocabulo muneris sui naturam explicant. Fieri vero facile potuit, ut indocti homines ad hæc. sacri codicis dicta posteriorem vocabuli *Martyr* significationem transferrent, et temere sibi propterea persuaderent, Apostolos inter eos poni debere, quos excellentiori sensu Christiani *Martyres* appellare solebant.” Sæc. prim. § xvi. No. Our historian is here, from the ambiguity of the word, accounting only for the alleged martyrdom of all the Apostles except John. But every body who reflects will be sensible, that the same mistake must have contributed to the increase of the number in other instances. For even in apostolical times, others than the Apostles, though more rarely, were called *witnesses*. Stephen and Antipas are so denominated in sacred writ. And as both these were put to death for their testimony, this has probably given rise in after-times to the appropriation of the name *witness* or *martyr*, to those who suffered death in the cause.

§ 15. I SHALL conclude, with adding to the observations on the words *schism* and *heresy*, that how much soever of a schismatical or heretical spirit, in the apostolic sense of the terms, may have contributed to the formation of the different sects into which the Christian world is at present divided ; no person who, in the spirit of candour and charity, adheres to that which, to the best of his judgment, is right, though, in this opinion, he should be mistaken, is, in the scriptural sense, either schismatic or heretic ; and that he, on the contrary, whatever sect he belong to, is more entitled to these odious appellations, who is most apt to throw the imputation upon others. Both terms, for they denote only different degrees of the same bad quality, always indicate a disposition and practice unfriendly to peace, harmony, and love.

Dissertation the Tenth.

The chief Things to be attended to in Translating.—A comparative View of the opposite Methods taken by Translators of Holy Writ.

PART I.

THE THINGS TO BE ATTENDED TO IN TRANSLATING.

To translate has been thought, by some, a very easy matter to one who understands tolerably the language from which, and has made some proficiency in the language into which, the translation is to be made. To translate well is, however, in my opinion, a task of more difficulty than is commonly imagined. That we may be the better able to judge in this question, let us consider what a translator, who would do justice to his author, and his subject, has to perform. The first thing, without doubt, which claims his attention, is to give a just representation of the sense of the original. This, it must be acknowledged, is the most essential of all. The second thing is, to convey into his version, as much as possible, in a consistency with the genius of the

language which he writes, the author's spirit and manner, and, if I may so express myself, the very character of his style. The third and last thing is, to take care, that the version have, at least, so far the quality of an original performance, as to appear natural and easy, such as shall give no handle to the critic to charge the translator with applying words improperly, or in a meaning not warranted by use, or combining them in a way which renders the sense obscure, and the construction ungrammatical, or even harsh.

§ 2. Now, to adjust matters so as, in a considerable degree, to attain all these objects, will be found, upon inquiry, not a little arduous, even to men who are well acquainted with the two languages, and have great command of words. In pursuit of one of the ends above mentioned, we are often in danger of losing sight totally of another: nay, on some occasions, it will appear impossible to attain one, without sacrificing both the others. It may happen, that I cannot do justice to the sense, without frequent recourse to circumlocutions; for the words of no language whatever will, at all times, exactly correspond with those of another. Yet, by this method, a writer whose manner is concise, simple, and energetic, is exhibited, in the translation, as employing a style which is at once diffuse, complex, and languid. Again, in endeavouring to exhibit the author's manner, and to confine myself, as nearly as possible, to the same number of words, and the like turn of expression, I may very imperfectly render

his sense, relating obscurely, ambiguously, and even improperly, what is expressed with great propriety and perspicuity in the original. And, in regard to the third object mentioned, it is evident, that when the two languages differ very much in their genius and structure, it must be exceedingly difficult for a translator to render this end perfectly compatible with the other two. It will perhaps be said, that this is of less importance, as it seems solely to regard the quality of the work, as a performance in the translator's language, whereas the other two regard the work only as an exhibition of the original. I admit that this is an object inferior to the other two; I meant it should be understood so, by mentioning it last. Yet even this is by no means so unimportant as some would imagine. That a writing be perspicuous in any language, much depends on the observance of propriety; and the beauty of the work (at least as far as purity is concerned) contributes not a little to its utility. What is well written, or well said, is always more attended to, better understood, and longer remembered, than what is improperly, weakly, or awkwardly, expressed.

§ 3. Now, if translation is in general attended with so much difficulty, what must we think of the chance of success which a translator has, when the subject is of so great importance, that an uncommon degree of attention to all the above mentioned objects, will be exacted of him; and when the difference, in point of idiom, of the

language from which, and of that into which the version is made, is as great, perhaps, as we have any example of. For, in translating the New Testament into English, it is not to the Greek idiom, nor to the Oriental, that we are required to adapt our own, but to a certain combination of both; often, rather, to the Hebrew and Chaldaic idioms, involved in Greek words and syntax. The analogy and prevailing usage in Greek, will, if we be not on our guard, sometimes mislead us. On the contrary, these are sometimes safe and proper guides. But, without a considerable acquaintance with both, it will be impossible to determine, when we ought to be directed by the one, and when by the other.

§ 4. THERE are two extremes in translating, which are commonly taken notice of by those who examine this subject critically; from one extreme, we derive what is called a close and literal, from the other, a loose and free translation. Each has its advocates. But, though the latter kind is most patronised, when the subject is a performance merely human, the general sentiments, as far as I am able to collect them, seem rather to favour the former, when the subject is any part of holy writ. And this difference appears to proceed from a very laudable principle, that we are not entitled to use so much freedom with the dictates of inspiration, as with the works of a fellow-creature. It often happens, however, on such general topics, when no particular version is referred to as an example of excess

on one side, or on the other, that people agree in words, when their opinions differ, and differ in words, when their opinions agree. For, I may consider a translation as close, which another would denominate free, or as free, which another would denominate close. Indeed, I imagine that, in the best sense of the words, a good translation ought to have both these qualities. To avoid all ambiguity, therefore, I shall call one extreme *literal*, as manifesting a greater attention to the letter than to the meaning; the other *loose*, as implying under it, not liberty, but licentiousness. In regard even to literal translations, there may be so many differences in degree, that, without specifying, it is in vain to argue, or to hope to lay down any principles that will prove entirely satisfactory.

$$\frac{\sqrt{44}}{33}$$

PART II.

STRICTURES ON ARIAS MONTANUS.

AMONG the Latin translations of Scripture, therefore, for I shall confine myself to these in this Dissertation, let us select *Arias Montanus* for an example of the literal. His version of both Testaments is very generally known, and commonly printed along with the original, not in separate columns, but, for the greater benefit of the

learner, interlined. This work of Arias, of all that I know, goes the farthest in this way, being precisely on the model of the Jewish translations, not so much of the Septuagint, though the Septuagint certainly exceeds in this respect, as on the model of Aquila, which, from the fragments that still remain of that version, appears to have been servilely literal, a mere *metaphrase*. Arias, therefore, is a fit example of what may be expected in this mode of translating.

§ 2. Now, that we may proceed more methodically in our examination, let us inquire how far every one of the three ends in translating, above mentioned, is answered by this version, or can be answered by a version constructed on the same plan. The first and principal end is to give a just representation of the sense of the original. ‘But how,’ it may be asked, ‘can a translator fail of attaining this end, who never wanders from the path marked out to him; who does not, like others, turn aside for a moment, to pluck flowers by the way, wherewith to garnish his performance; who is, on the contrary, always found in his author’s track; in short, who has it as his sole object, to give you, in the words of another language, exactly what his author says, and in the order and manner wherein he says it, and,’ I had almost added (for this, too, is his aim, though not always attainable,) ‘not one word more or less than he says?’ However he might fail, in

respect of the other ends mentioned, one would be apt to think, he must certainly succeed in conveying the sentiments of his author. Yet, upon trial, we find that, in no point whatever does the literal translator fail more remarkably, than in this, of exhibiting the sense. Nor will this be found so unaccountable, upon reflection, as, on a superficial view, it may appear. Were the words of the one language exactly correspondent to those of the other, in meaning and extent; were the modes of combining the words in both, entirely similar, and the grammatical or customary arrangement, the same; and were the idioms and phrases resulting thence, perfectly equivalent, such a conclusion might reasonably be deduced: but, when all the material circumstances are nearly the reverse, as is certainly the case of Hebrew, compared with Latin; when the greater part of the words of one, are far from corresponding accurately, either in meaning or in extent, to those of the other; when the construction is dissimilar, and the idioms, resulting from the like combinations of corresponding words, by no means equivalent, there is the greatest probability that an interpreter, of this stamp, will often exhibit to his readers what has no meaning at all, and sometimes a meaning very different from, or perhaps opposite to, that of his author.

§ 3. I SHALL, from the aforesaid translation, briefly illustrate what I have advanced; and that, first, in words, next, in phrases or idioms. I had

occasion, in a former Dissertation¹, to take notice of a pretty numerous class of words which, in no two languages whatever, are found perfectly to correspond, though in those tongues wherein there is a greater affinity, they come nearer to suit each other, than in those tongues wherein the affinity is less. In regard to such, I observed, that the translator's only possible method of rendering them justly, is by attending to the scope of the author, as discovered by the context, and choosing such a term in the language which he writes, as suits best the original term, in the particular situation in which he finds it.

§ 4. BUT, this is far from being the method of the literal translator. The defenders of this manner, would, if possible, have nothing subjected to the judgment of the interpreter, but have every thing determined by general and mechanical rules. Hence, they insist, above all things, on preserving uniformity, and rendering the same word in the original, wherever it occurs, or, however it is connected, by the same word in the version. And, as much the greater part of the words, not of one tongue only, but of every tongue, are equivocal, and have more significations than one, they have adopted these two rules for determining their choice, among the different meanings of which the term is susceptible. The first is, to adopt the meaning, wherever it is discoverable, to which etymology points, though in

¹ Diss. II. P. I. § 4.

defiance of the meaning suggested, both by the context, and by general use. When this rule does not answer, as when the derivation is uncertain, the second is, to adopt that which, of all the senses of the word, appears to the translator the most common, and to adhere to it inflexibly in every case, whatever absurdity or nonsense it may involve him in. I might mention also a third method, adopted sometimes, but much more rarely than either of the former, which is to combine the different meanings in the version. Thus the Hebrew word כָּבֵד answers sometimes to *βαρος weight*, sometimes to *δοξα glory*. Hence probably has arisen the Hellenistic idiom *βαρος δοξης, weight of glory*². The Latin word *salus* means *health*, answering to the Greek *ὑγίεια*; and often *salvation*, answering to *σωτηριον*. The Hebrew word is equally unequivocal with the Greek, yet our translators, from a respect to the Vulgate, have, in one place³, combined the two meanings into *saving health*, a more awkward expression, because more obscure and indefinite, but which denotes no more than *salvation*. Perhaps, not even the most literal interpreters observe inviolably these rules. But one thing is certain that, in those cases wherein they assume the privilege of dispensing with them, this measure is, in no respect, more necessary than in many of the cases wherein they rigidly observe them. I may add another thing, as equally certain, that, when-

² 2 Cor. iv. 17.

³ Psal. lxxvii. 2.

ever they think proper to supersede those rules, they betray a consciousness of the insufficiency of the fundamental principles of their method, as well as of the necessity there is, that the translator use his best discernment and skill for directing him, first, in the discovery of the meaning of his author, and, secondly, in the proper choice of words for expressing it in his version.

§ 5. I SHALL exemplify the observance of the two rules above mentioned, in the version I proposed to consider. And, first, for that of etymology; the passage in Genesis⁴, which is properly rendered in the common translation, *Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature*: Arias renders, *Reptificent aquæ reptile*. It is true, that the word which he barbarously translates *reptificent* (for there is no such Latin word,) is in the Hebrew conjugation called *hiphil*, of a verb which in *kal*, that is, in the simple and radical form, signifies *repere*, *to creep*. Analogically, therefore, the verb in *hiphil* should import, *to cause to creep*. It had been accordingly rendered by Pagninus, a critic of the same stamp, but not such an adept as Arias, *repere faciant*. But in Hebrew, as in all other languages, use, both in altering and in adding, exercises an uncontrollable dominion over all the parts of speech. We have just the same evidence that the original verb in *hiphil*, commonly signifies to produce in abundance, like fishes and reptiles, as we have that in

⁴ Gen. i. 20.

kal, it signifies *to creep*. Now, passing the barbarism *reptificent*, the sense which this version conveys, if it convey any sense, is totally different from the manifest sense of the author. It is the creation, or first production of things, which Moses is relating. Arias, in this instance, (as well as Pagnin,) seems to exhibit things as already produced, and to relate only how they were set in motion. What other meaning can we give to words importing: "Let the waters cause the "creeping thing to creep?" or, if, by a similar barbarism in English we may be allowed to give a more exact representation of the barbarous Latin of Arias: "Let the waters creepify the creeper?"

Another example of etymological version, in defiance of use and of common sense, we have, in the beginning of the song of Moses ⁵. The words rendered in the English translation, *My doctrine shall drop as the rain*, Arias translates, "Stillabit "ut pluvia assumptio mea." The word here rendered *assumptio* has, for its etymon, a verb which commonly signifies *sumo, capio*. That sage interpreter, it seems, thought it of more importance to acquaint his reader with this circumstance, than with the obvious meaning of the word itself. And thus, a passage which, in the original, is neither ambiguous nor obscure, is rendered in such a manner as would defy Oedipus to unriddle.

§ 6. As to the second rule mentioned, of adopting that which of all the significations of the

⁵ Deut. xxxii. 2.

word, appears to the translator the most common, and to adhere to it inflexibly in every case, however unsuitable it may be to the context, and however much it may mar the sense of the discourse; there is hardly a page, nay a paragraph, nay, a line in Arias, which does not furnish us with an example. Nor does it take place in one only, but in all the parts of speech. First, in nouns⁶, *Et hoc verbum quo circumcidit*. The Hebrew word rendered *verbum*, answers both to *verbum*, and to *res*; but as the more common meaning is *verbum*, it must, by this rule, be made always so, in spite of the connection. In this manner he corrects Pagnin, who had rendered the expression, justly and intelligibly, *Hæc est causa quare circumcidit*. In that expression⁷, *Filius fructescens Joseph super fontem*, we have both his rules exemplified, the first in the barbarous participle *fructescens*, which has a derivation similar to the Hebrew word; the second in the substantive *filius*, which is no doubt the most common signification of the Hebrew בן *ben*, and in the preposition *super*. In this manner he corrects Pagnin, who had said, not badly, *Ramus crescens Joseph juxta fontem*.

§ 7. AND, to shew that he made as little account of the reproach of solecism as of barbarism, he says, as absurdly as unmeaningly, *Pater fuit sedentis tentorium*⁸, giving a regimen

⁶ Joshua, v. 4.⁷ Gen. xlix. 22.⁸ Gen. iv. 20.

to a neuter verb. Pagnin had said, *inhabitantis*. That this is conformable to the signification of the Hebrew word in this passage, which the other is not, there can be no question; but it might fairly bear a question, whether *sedeo* or *inhabito* be the more common meaning of the Hebrew word. The same strange rule he follows in the indeclinable parts of speech, the prepositions in particular, which, being few in Hebrew, and consequently of more extensive signification, he has chosen always to render the same way, thereby darkening the clearest passages, and expressing, in the most absurd manner, the most elegant.

As I would avoid being tedious, I shall produce but two other examples of this, having given one already from Jacob's benediction to his sons, though the whole work abounds with examples. The expression used by Pagnin, in the account of the creation, *Dividat aquas ab aquis*⁹, he has thus reformed, *Sit dividens inter aquas ad aquas*. The other is in the account of the murder of Abel¹⁰, *Surrexit Cain ad Hebel*, where Pagnin had used the preposition *contra*. As a specimen of the servile manner in which he traces the arrangement and construction of the original, to the total subversion of all rule and order in the language which he writes, I shall give the following passage in the New Testament, not selected as peculiar, for such are to

⁹ Gen. i. 6.

¹⁰ Gen. iv. 8.

be found in every page : *De quidem enim ministerio in sanctos, ex abundantia mihi est scribere vobis*¹¹.

§ 8. To proceed now, as I proposed, to phrases or combinations of words : I shall, first, produce some examples which convey a mere jargon of words, combined ungrammatically, and, therefore, to those who do not understand the language out of which the translation is made, unintelligibly. Such are the following : *Istæ generationes cæli et terræ, in creari ea, in die facere Deus terram et cælum*¹².—*Emisit eum Dominus ad colendam terram quod sumptus est inde*¹³.—*Major iniquitas mea quam parcere*¹⁴. But as, in certain cases, this manner of copying a foreign idiom, makes downright nonsense, in other cases, the like combinations of corresponding words, in different languages, though not unmeaning, do not convey the same meaning, nay, sometimes convey meanings the very reverse of one another. Thus, two negatives in Greek and French deny strongly, in Latin and English they affirm. כֹּל לֹא *col la*, in Hebrew is *none* ; *non omnis*, in Latin, which is a literal version, and *not all*, in English, denote *some*. In like manner, οὐκ, construed with οὐδεις, in Greek, is still *nobody* ; *non nemo*, in Latin, which is a literal version, is *somebody*. The words και ου μελει σοι περι ουδενος¹⁵, rendered properly in the common version, *and carest for no*

¹¹ 2 Cor. ix. 1.

¹² Gen. ii. 4.

¹³ Gen. iii. 23.

¹⁴ Gen. iv. 13.

¹⁵ Mark, xii. 14.

man, are translated by Arias, *Et non cura est tibi de nullo* ; the very opposite of the author's sentiment, which would have been more justly rendered, *Et cura est tibi de nullo* ; or, as it is in the Vulgate, *Non curas quenquam*. In this, however, hardly any of the metaphrasts have judged proper to observe a strict uniformity ; though, I will venture to say, it would be impossible to assign a good reason why, in some instances, they depart from that method, whilst, in others, they tenaciously adhere to it.

§ 9. It ought, withal, to be observed, that several interpreters who, in translating single words, have not confined themselves to the absurd method above mentioned, could not be persuaded to take the same liberty with idioms and phrases. Thus Arias has but copied the Vulgate in translating, *Ὅτι οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ πᾶν ῥημα*¹⁶, *Quia non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum*. In this short sentence there are no fewer than three improprieties, one arising from the mis-translation of a noun, and the other two from mis-translated idioms. *Ῥημα*, in Hellenistic usage, is equivalent to the Hebrew דָּבַר *daber*; which, as has been observed, signifies not only *verbum*, a word, but *res*, or *negotium*, a thing ; which last is the manifest sense of it in the passage quoted : the second is the rendering of *οὐ πᾶν*, *non omne*, and not, as it ought to have been, *nullum* : the third arises from using the future

¹⁶ Luke, i. 37.

in Latin, in the enunciation of an universal truth. It ought to have been remembered, that the Hebrew has no present tense; one who writes it, is consequently, obliged often to use the other tenses, and especially the future, in enunciating general truths, for which, in all modern languages, as well as in Greek and Latin, we employ the present. In consequence of these blunders, the version, as it lies, is perfectly unmeaning; whereas, no person, that is even but a smatterer in Hebrew, will hesitate to declare, that the sense is completely expressed in English, in these words: *For nothing is impossible with God.*

§ 10. THERE are few of the old versions which have kept entirely clear of this fault. In the ancient Latin translation called the Italic, whereof we have not now a complete copy remaining, there were many more barbarisms than in the present Vulgate. And even Jerom himself acquaints us that, when he set about making a new version, he left several things which he knew to be not properly expressed, for fear of giving offence to the weak, by his numerous and bold alterations. This idiom of *non omne*, for *nihil*, or *nullum*, seems to have been one which, in many places, though not in all, he has corrected. Thus, what, in the old Italic, after the Septuagint, was *Non est omne recens sub sole*¹⁷, he has rendered perspicuously and properly, *Nihil sub sole novum.*

¹⁷ Eccl. i. 9.

A slavish attachment to the letter, in translating, without any regard to the meaning, is originally the offspring of the superstition, not of the church, but of the synagogue, where it would have been more suitable in Christian interpreters, the ministers, not of the letter, but of the spirit, to have allowed it to remain.

§ 11. THAT this is not the way to answer the first and principal end of translating, has, I think, been sufficiently demonstrated. Instead of the sense of the original, it sometimes gives us downright nonsense ; frequently a meaning quite different, and not seldom it makes the author say in another language, the reverse of what he said in his own. Can it then be doubted, that this is not the way to attain the second end in translating ? Is this a method whereby a translator can convey into his version, as much as possible, in a consistency with the genius of a different language, the author's spirit and manner, and (so to speak) the very character of his style ? It is evident, that the first end may be attained, where this is not attained. An author's meaning may be given, but in a different manner ; a concise writer may be made to express himself diffusely, or a diffuse writer concisely ; the sense of an elegant work may be justly given, though in a homely dress. But it does not hold conversely, that the second end may be attained without the first ; for when an author's sense is not given, he is not fairly represented. Can we do justice to his manner, if, when he reasons

consequentially, he be exhibited as talking incoherently ; if what he writes perspicuously, be rendered ambiguously or obscurely ; if what flows from his pen naturally and easily, in the true idiom and construction of his language, be rendered ruggedly and unnaturally, by the violence perpetually done to the construction of the language, into which it is transmuted, rather than translated ? The manner of a tall man, who walks with dignity, would be wretchedly represented by a dwarf who had no other mode of imitation, but to number and trace his footsteps. The immoderate strides and distortions which this ridiculous attempt would oblige the imitator to employ, could never convey to the spectators an idea of easy and graceful motion.

§ 12. THE third end of translating, that of preserving purity and perspicuity in the language into which the version is made, is not so much as aimed at, by any of the literal tribe. Upon the whole, I cannot express my sentiments more justly both of Arias and of Pagnin, than in the words of Houbigant, who¹⁸, in assigning his reasons for not adopting the version of either, says, “ Non facerem meam illam versionem Ariæ Montani horridam, inficetam, obscuram, talem denique qualem composuisset, si quis homines “ deterrere ab sacris codicibus legendis voluisset.

¹⁸ Proleg. p. 178.

“ Non illam Pagnini, quam Arias, jam malam, “ fecit imitando ac interpolando pejorem.” In this last remark, which may in part be justified by some of the foregoing examples, he perfectly agrees with Father Simon, who says of Arias’s amendments on Pagnin’s translation, *Quot correctiones, tot corruptiones*. For there is hardly any thing altered that is not for the worse. Such Latin versions would be quite unintelligible, if it were not for the knowledge we have of the original, and of the common English version, which is as literal as any version ought to be, and sometimes more so. The coincidence of two or three words recalls the whole passage to our memory; but we may venture to pronounce that, to an ancient Roman who knew nothing of the learning or opinions of the East, the greater part of Arias’s Bible would appear no better than a jumble of words without meaning.

§ 13. To all the other evil consequences resulting from such versions, we ought to add, that they necessarily lead the unlearned reader into an opinion that the original which is susceptible of them, must be totally indefinite, equivocal, and obscure. Few, without making the experiment, can allow themselves to think, that it is equally possible, by this mode of translation, completely to disfigure, and render unintelligible, what is written with plainness and simplicity, and without any ambiguity, in their mother-tongue. Yet nothing is more certain than that the most

perspicuous writing, in any language, may be totally disguised by this treatment¹⁹. Were the

¹⁹ As it is impossible, without an example, to conceive how monstrous the transformation is, which it occasions, I shall here subjoin a specimen of a few English sentences translated into Latin, in the taste and manner of Arias. “Ego inveni
“ aliquod pecus in meo frumento, et posui illa in meam libram.
“ Ego rogavi unum qui stabat per, si ille novit cujus illa
“ erant. Sed ille vertit unam viam a me, et fecit non ita mul-
“ tum ut vindicare salvum ad redire mihi ullam responsionem.
“ Super hoc ego rogavi unum alium qui dixit unam magnam
“ tabulam abiegnam in replicatione quam ego feci non sub-
“ stare. Quam unquam ego volui non habere posita illa sur-
“ sum, habui ego notum ad quem illa pertinébant; nam ego
“ didici post custodias quod ille fuit unus ego fui multum
“ aspectus ad.” Were these few lines put into the hands of a learned foreigner, who does not understand English, he might sooner learn to read Chinese, than to divine their meaning. Yet a little attention would bring an Englishman who knows Latin, soon to discover that they were intended as a version, if we may call it so, of the following words, which, in the manner of Arias, I give with the version interlined.

Ego inveni aliquod pecus in meo frumento, et posui illa in meam
I found some cattle in my corn, and put them into my
libram. Ego rogavi unum qui stabat per si ille novit cujus
pound. I asked one who stood by if he knew whose
illa erant. Sed ille vertit unam viam a me, et fecit non
they were. But he turned a way from me, and did not
ita multum ut vindicare salvum ad redire mihi ullam responsi-
so much as vouch safe to return me any answer.
onem. Super hoc ego rogavi unum alium qui dixit unam
Upon this I asked another who said a
magnam tabulam abiegnam in replicatione quam ego feci non
great deal in reply which I did not
substare. Quam unquam ego volui non habere posita illa
understand. How ever I would not have put them

ancient Greek or Latin classics, in prose or verse, to be thus rendered into any modern tongue, nobody could bear to read them. Strange indeed,

sursum, habui ego notum ad quem illa pertinebant, nam ego
up, had I known to whom they belonged, for I
 didici post custodias quod ille fuit unus ego fui multum aspectus
learned afterwards. that he was one I was much beholden
 ad.

to.

Should one object that the Latin words here employed do not suit the sense of the corresponding words in the passage translated, it is admitted that they do not; but they are selected in exact conformity to the fundamental rules followed by Arias. Thus *una via* away, *vindicare salvum* vouchsafe, *quam unquam* however, *tabula abiagna* deal, *substare* understand, *post custodias* afterwards, *aspectus* beholden, are all agreeable to the primary rule of etymology, and, in no respect, worse than *reptifico*, where both sense and use require *produco*; or *assumptio* for *doctrina*, to the utter destruction of all meaning, or *non omnis* for *nullus*, which gives a meaning quite different. But by what rule, it may be asked, is *pound* rendered *libra*, in a case wherein it manifestly means *septum*? By the same rule, it is answered, whereby *iashab* is rendered *sedere*, in a case wherein both the sense and the construction required *inhabitare*, and *daber* rendered *verbum*, where it manifestly means *res*, the golden rule of uniformity, by which every term ought always to be rendered the same way, and agreeably to its most common signification, without minding whether it makes sense or nonsense so rendered. [The literal translator follows implicitly the sage direction given by Cajetan, “ Non sit vobis curæ, si sensus non apparet, quia non est vestri officii exponere sed interpretari: interpretamini sicut jacet, et relinquatis expositibus curam intelligendi.” Præf. Comment. in Psalm.] Now it is certain that *pound* occurs oftener in the sense of *libra* than in that of *septum*. But how do you admit such gross solecisms

that a treatment should ever have been accounted respectful to the sacred penmen, which, if given to any other writer, would be universally condemned, as no better than dressing him in a fool's coat.

I am not at all surprised that certain great men of the church of Rome, like Cardinal Cajetan, who (though, with foreign assistance, he translated the Psalms) did not understand a word of Hebrew, show themselves great admirers of this method. The more unintelligible the Scriptures are made, the greater is the need of an infallible interpreter, an article of which they never lose sight. But that others, who have not the same motive, and possess a degree of understanding superior to that of a Jewish cabalist, should recommend an expedient, which serves only for debasing and discrediting the dictates of the divine spirit, appears perfectly unaccountable. I shall only add, that versions of this kind are very improperly called translations. The French have a

as redire responsionem? I answer, Is this more so than *sedere tentorium?* or do the prepositions as used here *stabat per* and *aspectus ad*, make the construction more monstrous, than *inter ad* in that sentence *sit dividens inter aquas ad aquas?* Besides, there is not a word in the above specimen, which, taken severally, is not Latin: so much cannot be said for Arias, whose work is over-run with barbarisms as well as solecisms. Witness his *fructescens* and *reptificent*, in the few examples above produced. And in regard to the total incoherence and want of construction, can any thing in this way exceed *in creari ea*, or *in die facere Deus*, or *ad terram quod sumptus est inde*, or *major iniquitas quam parcere?*

convenient word, *travesty*, by which they denote the metamorphosis of a serious work into mere burlesque by dressing it in such language as renders it ridiculous, makes the noblest thoughts appear contemptible, the richest images beggarly, and the most judicious observations absurd. I would not say, therefore, the Bible *translated*, but the Bible *travestied*, by Arias Montanus. For that can never deserve the name of a translation, which gives you neither the matter nor the manner of the author, but, on the contrary, often exhibits both as the reverse of what they are. Malvenda, a Dominican, is another interpreter of the same tribe with his brother Pagnin, and with Arias, whom he is said greatly to have exceeded in darkness, barbarism, and nonsense. I never saw his version, but have reason to believe, from the accounts given of it, by good judges, that it can answer no valuable purpose.

($\frac{45}{33}$)

PART III.

STRICTURES ON THE VULGATE.

I PROCEED NOW to consider a little the merit of some other Latin translations of holy writ. The first, doubtless, that deserves our attention, in respect both of antiquity, and I may say, of

universality in the Western churches, is the *Vulgate*. The version which is known by this name, at least the greater part of it, is justly ascribed to Jerom, and must therefore be dated from the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth century. As its reception in the church was gradual, voluntary, and not in consequence of the command of a superior, and as, for some ages, the old Latin version, called the *Italic*, continued, partly from the influence of custom, partly from respect to antiquity, to be regarded and used by many, there is reason to believe that a part of that version still remains in the *Vulgate*, and is, in a manner, blended with it. One thing at least is certain that, in several places of the *Vulgate*, we find those expressions and ways of rendering which that learned father, in his works, strongly condemned, at the same time that, in other parts, we see his emendations regularly followed. Besides, as I hinted before, there were several corrections which, though his judgment approved them, he did not, for fear of shocking the sentiments of the people, think it prudent to adopt. From this it may naturally be inferred, that the manner and style of the *Vulgate* will not be found equal and uniform. And I believe no person who has examined it with a critical eye, will deny that this is the case.

§ 2. FROM what remains of the old *Italic*, it appears to have been much in the taste of almost all the Jewish translations, extremely literal, and consequently, in a great degree, obscure, ambiguous,

and barbarous. To give a Latin translation of the Scriptures, which might at once be more perspicuous, and more just to the original, was the great and laudable design of that eminent light of the Western churches above mentioned. The Old Testament part of the Italic version had been made entirely from the Septuagint (for the Hebrew Scriptures were, for some ages, of no estimation in the church;) but Jerom, being well skilled in Hebrew, undertook to translate from the original. This itself has made, in some passages, a considerable difference on the sense. And, as the version of the Seventy has generally the mark of a servile attachment to the letter, there can be no doubt that there must have been, in the Hebrew manuscripts extant at the times when the several parts of that version were made, considerable differences of reading from those in common use at present. And though I think, upon the whole, that the Hebrew Scriptures are much preferable, an acquaintance with the Septuagint is of great importance for several reasons, and particularly for this, that it often assists in suggesting the true reading, in cases where the present Hebrew copies are obscure, or appear to have been vitiated. Jerom, in such cases, judiciously recurred to that translation; and often, when it was more perspicuous than the Hebrew, and the meaning which it contained seemed better adapted to the context, borrowed light from it. Perhaps he would have done still better to have recurred oftener. For, however learned those Jews were, to whose assistance he owed the

acquisition of the language, they were strongly tinctured with the cabalistical prejudices which prevailed, more or less, in all the literati of that nation. Hence they were sometimes led, on very fanciful grounds, to assign to words and phrases, meanings not supported by the obvious sense of the context, nor even by the most ancient versions and paraphrases. In this case, there can be no doubt that these were more to be confided in than his Jewish instructors.

§ 3. No intelligent person will question the fitness of that judicious and learned writer, for the task of translating the Bible into his native language. But that we may not be led too far in transferring to the work, the personal merit of the author, we ought to remember two things, first, that the Vulgate, as we have it at present, is not entirely the work of Jerom; and, secondly, that even in what Jerom translated, he left many things, as he himself acknowledges, which needed correction, but which he did not choose to alter, lest the liberties taken with the old translation should scandalize the vulgar. It is no wonder, then, that great inequalities should be observable in the execution. In many places it is excellent. The sense of the original is conveyed justly and perspicuously; no affectation in the style; on the contrary, the greatest simplicity combined with purity. But this cannot be said with truth of every part of that work.

§ 4. IN the preceding part of this Dissertation²⁰, I took notice of one passage rendered exactly in the manner of Arias, who found nothing to alter in it, in order to bring it down to his level. Indeed there are many such instances. Thus *οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ* is rendered, *Non fieret salva omnis caro*²¹. In some places we find barbarisms and solecisms, to which it would be difficult to discover a temptation, the just expression being both as literal and as obvious as the improper one that has been preferred to it. Of this sort, we may call, *Neque nubent, neque nubentur*²². *Nonne vos magis plures estis illis*²³? *Non capit prophetam perire extra Jerusalem*²⁴, and *Filius hominis non venit ministrari sed ministrare*²⁵. Yet, as to the last example, the same words in another Gospel are rendered without the solecism, *Filius hominis non venit ut ministraretur ei, sed ut ministraret*²⁶. Very often we meet with instances of the same original word rendered by the same Latin word, when the sense is manifestly different, and the idiom of the tongue does not admit it. This absurdity extends even to conjunctions. The Greek *ὅτι* answers frequently to the Latin *quia*, *because*, and not seldom, to *quod*, *that*. Here, however, it is almost uniformly in defiance of grammar and common sense, rendered *quia* or *quoniam*. Thus, *Tunc confitebor illis quia nunquam novi vos*²⁷, and *Magister sci-*

²⁰ § 9.

²² Matth. xxii. 30. Mark, xii. 25.

²⁴ Luke, xiii. 33.

²⁶ Mark, x. 45.

²¹ Matth. xxiv. 22.

²³ Matth. vi. 26.

²⁵ Matth. xx. 28.

²⁷ Matth. vii. 23.

*mus quia verax es*²⁸. These expressions are no better Latin, than these which follow are English. *Then will I confess to them, because I never knew you, and, Master we know because thou art true*: words which, if they suggest any meaning, it is evidently not the meaning of the author; nor is it a meaning which the original would have ever suggested to one who understands the language.

Nay, sometimes even the favourite rule of uniformity is violated, but not for the sake of keeping to the sense, the sense being rather hurt by the violation. Thus *λαος* answering to *populus*, and commonly so rendered, is sometimes improperly translated *plebs*. *Εποιησε λυτρωσιν τω λαω αυτου*²⁹, is rendered *Fecit redemptionem plebis suæ*. Sometimes the most unmeaning barbarisms are adopted merely to represent the etymology of the original term. *Τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον dos ημιν σημερον*, is rendered *Panem nostrum supersubstantialiam da nobis hodie*³⁰. *Panis supersubstantialis* is just as barbarous Latin as *super-substantial bread* would be English, and equally unintelligible. There is an additional evil resulting from this manner of treating holy writ, that the solecisms, barbarisms, and nonsensical expressions which it gives rise to, prove a fund of materials to the visionary, out of which his imagination frames a thousand mysteries.

§ 5. I WOULD not, however, be understood, by these remarks, as passing a general censure on

²⁸ Matth. xxii. 16.

²⁹ Luke, i. 68.

³⁰ Matth. vi. 11.

this version, which, though not to be followed implicitly, may, I am convinced, be of great service to the critic. It ought to weigh with us, that even the latest part of this translation was made about fourteen hundred years ago, and is, consequently, many centuries prior to all the Latin translations now current, none of which can claim an earlier date than the revival of letters in the West. I do not use this argument from an immoderate regard to antiquity, or from the notion that age can give a sanction to error. But there are two things, in this circumstance, which ought to recommend the work in question, to the attentive examination of the critic. First that, having been made from manuscripts older than most, perhaps than any, now extant, it serves, in some degree, to supply the place of those manuscripts, and furnish us with the probable means of discovering what the readings were, which Jerom found in the copies which he so carefully collated. Another reason is that, being finished long before those controversies arose which are the foundation of most of the sects now subsisting, we may rest assured that, in regard to these, there will be no bias from party zeal to either side of the question. We cannot say so much for the translations which have been made since the rise of Protestantism, either by Protestants or by Papists. And these are, in my opinion, two not inconsiderable advantages.

§ 6. I TAKE notice of the last the rather, because many Protestants, on account of the declara-

tion of its authenticity, solemnly pronounced by the council of Trent, cannot avoid considering it as a Popish Bible, calculated for supporting the Roman Catholic cause. Now this is an illiberal conclusion, the offspring of ignorance, which I think it of some consequence to refute. It is no further back than the sixteenth century, since that judgment was given in approbation of this version, the first authoritative declaration made in its favour. Yet the estimation in which it was universally held throughout the Western churches, was, to say the least, not inferior, before that period, to what it is at present. And, we may say with truth that, though no judicious Protestant will think more favourably of this translation, on account of their verdict; neither will he, on this account, think less favourably of it. It was not because this version was peculiarly adapted to the Romish system, that it received the sanction of that synod; but, because it was the only Bible with which the far greater part of the members had, from their infancy, had the least acquaintance. There were but few in that assembly who understood either Greek or Hebrew. They had heard that the Protestants, the new heretics, as they called them, had frequent recourse to the original, and were beginning to make versions from it; a practice of which their own ignorance of the original made them the more jealous. Their fears being thus alarmed, they were exceedingly anxious to interpose their authority, by the declaration above mentioned, for preventing new translations being obtruded on the people. They

knew what the Vulgate contained; and had been early accustomed to explain it in their own way. But they did not know what might be produced from new translations. Therefore, to preoccupy men's minds, and prevent every true son of the church from reading other, especially modern, translations, and from paying any regard to what might be urged from the original, the very indefinite sentence was pronounced in favour of the Vulgate, *vetus et vulgata editio*, that, in all disputes, it should be held for authentic, *ut pro authentica habeatur*.

§ 7. Now, if, instead of this measure, that council had ordered a translation to be made by men nominated by them, in opposition to those published by Protestants, the case would have been very different: for, we may justly say that, amidst such a ferment as was then excited, there should have appeared, in a version so prepared, any thing like impartiality, candour, or discernment, would have been morally impossible. Yet, even such a production would have been entitled to a fair examination from the critic, who ought never to disdain to receive information from an adversary, and to judge impartially of what he offers. As that, however, was not the case, we ought not to consider the version in question as either the better, or the worse, for their verdict. It is but doing justice to say, that it is no way calculated to support Romish errors and corruptions. It had been in current use in the church, for ages before the much greater part of those errors and corrup-

tions was introduced. No doubt the schoolmen had acquired the knack of explaining it in such a way as favoured their own prejudices. But is this any more than what we find the most discordant sects acquire with regard to the original, or even to a translation which they use in common? For my own part, though it were my sole purpose, in recurring to a version, to refute the absurdities and corruptions of Popery, I should not desire other or better arguments than those I am supplied with by that very version, which one of their own councils has declared authentic.

§ 3. I AM not ignorant that a few passages have been produced, wherein the Vulgate and the original convey different meanings, and wherein the meaning of the Vulgate appears to favour the abuses established in that church. Some of these, but neither many, nor of great moment, are, no doubt, corruptions in the text, probably not intentional, but accidental, to which the originals in Hebrew and Greek have been, in like manner, liable, and from which no ancient book extant can be affirmed to be totally exempted. With respect to others of them, they will be found, upon a nearer inspection, as little favourable to Romish superstition, as the common reading in the Hebrew or the Greek. What is justly rendered in our version, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise*

*his heel*³¹, is in such a manner translated in the Vulgate, as to afford some colour for the extraordinary honours paid the virgin mother of our Lord. *Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et sementuum et semen illius. Ipsa conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus.* “She shall bruise thy head.” In this way it has been understood by some of their capital painters, who, in their pictures of the Virgin, have represented her treading on a serpent. It is, however certain, that their best critics admit this to be an error, and recur to some ancient manuscripts of the Vulgate which read *ipsum* not *ipsa*.

A still grosser blunder, which seems to give countenance to the worship of relics, is in the passage thus rendered by our interpreters: *By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff*³²: in the Vulgate thus: *Fide Jacob moriens singulos filiorum Joseph benedixit, et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus*; “adored the top of his rod;” as the version made from the Vulgate by English Romanists, and published at Rheims, expresses it. But the best judges among Roman Catholics admit, that the Latin text is not entire in this place, and that there has been an accidental omission of the preposition, through the carelessness of transcribers. For they have not now a writer of any name, who infers, from the declaration of authenticity, either the infallibility of the translator or the exactness of the cop-

³¹ Gen. iii. 15.

³² Heb. xi. 21.

iers. Houbigant, a priest of the Oratory, has not been restrained by that sentence, from making a new translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Latin, wherein he uses as much freedom with the Vulgate, in correcting what appeared to him faulty in it, as any reasonable Protestant, in this country, would do with the common English translation. Nay, which is more extraordinary, in the execution of this work, he had the countenance of the then reigning pontiff. In his version he has corrected the passage quoted from Genesis, and said, "*Illud*," (not *illa*) "conteret *caput tuum*." I make no doubt that he would have corrected the other passage also, if he had made a version of the New Testament.

§ 9. I KNOW it has also been urged, that there are some things in the Vulgate, which favour the style and doctrine of Rome, particularly in what regards the sacraments; and that such things are to be found in places where there is no ground to suspect a various reading, nor that the text of the Vulgate has undergone any alteration, either intentional or accidental. Could this point be evinced in a satisfactory manner, it would allow more to Popery, on the score of antiquity, than, in my opinion, she is entitled to. It is true that marriage appears, in one passage, to be called a sacrament. Paul, after recommending the duties of husbands and wives, and enforcing his recommendations by the resemblance which marriage bears to the relation subsisting between Christ and his church, having quoted these

words from Moses, *For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh*; adds, as it is expressed in the Vulgate, *Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia*³³; as expressed in the English translation, *This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the church*; that is, as I had occasion to observe in the preceding Dissertation, to which I refer the reader³⁴, ‘This is ‘capable of an important and figurative interpretation, I mean as it relates to Christ and the ‘church.’ Under the Mosaic economy, the relation wherein God stood to Israel, is often represented under the figure of marriage; and it is common with the penmen of the New Testament, to transfer those images, whereby the union between God and his people is illustrated in the Old, to that which subsists between Christ and his church. It is evident that, by the Latin word *sacramentum*, the Greek *μυστηριον* is frequently rendered in the New Testament; and it is no less evident, not only from the application of the word in that version, but from the general use of it, in ecclesiastical writers, in the primitive ages, that it often denoted no more than an allegorical or figurative meaning, which may be assigned to any narrative or injunction; a meaning more sublime than that which is at first suggested by the words. Thus, the moral conveyed under an apologue or parable was with them the *sacrament*,

³³ Eph. v. 32.

³⁴ Part I. § 7, 8.

that is, the hidden meaning of the apologue or parable. In *ego dicam tibi sacramentum mulieris et bestię quę portat eam*³⁵, I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast which carrieth her; it is indubitable, that *μυστηριον*, or *sacramentum*, means the hidden meaning of that vision. It is very plain that, in their use, the sense of the word *sacramentum* was totally different from that which it has at present, either among Protestants or among Papists³⁶. At the same time, there can be no question, that the misunderstanding of the passage quoted above, from the Epistle to the Ephesians, has given rise to the exaltation of matrimony into a sacrament. Such are the effects of the perversion of words, through the gradual change of customs; a perversion incident to every language, but which no translator can foresee.

No more is their doctrine of merit supported by the following expression: *Talibus hostiis promeretur Deus*³⁷; which, though faulty in point of purity, means no more than is expressed in the English translation, in these words: *With such sacrifices God is well pleased*. It is by common use, and not by scholastic quibbles, that the language of the sacred writers ought to be interpreted. Again, the command which so often occurs in the Gospels, *pœnitentiam agite*, seems at first to favour the Popish doctrine of *penance*. In conformity to this idea, the Rhemish translators render it *do penance*. But nothing is more

³⁵ Rev. xvii. 7.³⁶ Diss. IX. P. I.³⁷ Heb. xiii. 16.

evident, than that this is a perversion of the phrase from its ancient meaning, occasioned by the corruptions which have insensibly crept into the church. That the words, as used by the Latin translator, meant originally as much, at least, as the English word *repent*, cannot admit a question ; and thus much is allowed by the critics of that communion. In this manner Maldonate, a learned Jesuit, in his Commentary³⁸, explains *pœnitentiam agite*, as of the same import with *parate vias Domini, rectas facite semitas ejus* : and both as signifying *Relinquitte errores, et sequimini veritatem : discedite a malo, et facite bonum*. He understood no otherwise the *agite pœnitentiam* of the Latin translator, than we understand the *μετανοείτε* of the Evangelist. Accordingly, the same Greek word is, in one place of that version, rendered *pœnitementi*³⁹. But the introduction of the doctrine of auricular confession, of the necessity for obtaining absolution, of submitting to the punishment prescribed by the priest for the sins confessed, which they have come to denominate *pœnitentia*, and their styling the whole of this institution of theirs the *sacrament of penance*, which is of a much later date than that version, has diverted men's minds from attending to the primitive, and only proper, import of the phrase. *Agite pœnitentiam* was not, therefore, originally a mis-translation of the Greek *μετανοείτε*, though not sufficiently expressive ; but the abuse which has gradually taken place in the Latin church,

³⁸ On Matth. vii. 15.

³⁹ Mark, i. 15.

and the misapplication of the term which it has occasioned, have in a manner justled out the original meaning, and rendered the words, in their present acceptance, totally improper⁴⁰.

§ 10. SEVERAL other words and expressions give scope for the like observations. But, after what has been said, it is not necessary to enter further into particulars. The Vulgate may reasonably be pronounced, upon the whole, a good and faithful version. That it is unequal in the style, in respect both of purity and of perspicuity, is very evident ; nay, to such a degree, as plainly to evince that it has not all issued from the same pen. Considered in gross, we have reason to think it greatly inferior to Jerom's translation, as finished by himself. I may add, we have reason also to consider the version which Jerom actually made, as greatly inferior to what he could have made, and would have made, if he had thought himself at liberty to follow entirely his own judgment, and had not been much restrained by the prejudices of the people. I have already observed the advantages redounding to the critic from the use of this version, which are in some degree peculiar. I shall only add, that its language, barbarous as it often is, has its use in assisting us to understand, more perfectly, the Latin ecclesiastical writers of the early ages.

⁴⁰ For further illustration on this article, see Diss. XI. Part II. § 4.

PART IV.

STRICTURES ON CASTALIO.

HAVING shown, that it is impossible to do justice to an author, or to his subject, by attempting to track him, and always to be found in his footsteps, I shall now animadvert a little on those translators who are in the opposite extreme ; whose manner is so loose, rambling, and desultory, that, though they move nearly in the same direction with their author, pointing to the same object, they keep scarcely within sight of his path. Of the former excess, Arias Montanus is a perfect model : the Vulgate is often too much so. Of the latter, the most remarkable example we have in Latin, is Castalio. Yet Castalio's work is no paraphrase, such as we have sometimes seen under the name of *liberal translations* : for in these, there are always interwoven with the thoughts of the author, those of his interpreter, under the notion of their importance, either for illustrating, or for enforcing, the sentiments of the original. The paraphrast does not confine himself to the humble task of the translator, who proposes to exhibit, pure and unmixed, the sentiments of another, clothed, indeed, in a different dress, namely, such as the country,

into which he introduces them, can supply him with. The paraphrast, on the contrary, claims to share with the author in the merit of the work, not in respect of the language merely, for to this every interpreter has a claim, but in respect of what is much more important, the sense: nay, further, if the sentiments of these two happen to jar, no uncommon case, it is easy to conjecture whose will predominate in the paraphrase. But it is not with paraphrasts that I have here to do. A loose manner of translating is sometimes adopted, not for the sake of insinuating, artfully, the translator's opinions, by blending them with the sentiments of the author, but merely for the sake of expressing with elegance, and in an oratorical manner, the sense of the original.

§ 2. THIS was acknowledged to be in a high degree Castalio's object in translating. He had observed, with grief, that great numbers were withheld from reading the Scriptures, that is, the Vulgate, the only version of any account then extant, by the rudeness, as well as the obscurity, of the style. To give the public a Bible more elegantly and perspicuously written, he considered as at least an innocent, if not a laudable, artifice for inducing students, especially those of the younger sort, to read the Scriptures with attention, and to throw aside books full of indecencies, then much in vogue, because recommended by the beauty and ornaments of language. "Cupicbam," says he⁴¹, "extare Latiniorem aliquam,

⁴¹ Cast. Defens. Translat. &c.

“ necnon fidelio rem, et magis perspicuam sacra-
 rum literarum translationem, ex qua posset
 eadem opera pietas cum Latino sermone disci,
 ut hac ratione et tempori consuleretur, et homi-
 nes ad legenda sacra pellicerentur.” The mo-
 tive was surely commendable; and the reason
 whereon it was founded, a general disuse of the
 Scriptures, on account of the badness of their
 language, is but too notorious. Cardinal Bembo,
 a man of some note and literature under the
 pontificate of Leo X. in whose time the Reforma-
 tion commenced, is said to have expressed him-
 self strongly on this subject, that he durst not
 read the Bible, for fear of corrupting his style;
 an expression which had a very unfavourable
 aspect, especially in a churchman. Nevertheless,
 when we consider that, by the Bible he meant the
 Vulgate, and by his style, his Latinity; this
 declaration, judged with candour, will not be
 found to merit all the censure which Brown⁴²,
 and others, have bestowed upon it. For, surely
 no one who understands Latin, will say, that he
 wishes to form his style in that language on the
 Vulgate. Nor does any reflection on the lan-
 guage of that translation affect, in the smallest
 degree, the sacred writers. The character of
 Moses’s style, in particular, is simplicity, serious-
 ness, perspicuity, and purity. The first and sec-
 ond of these qualities are, in general, well ex-
 hibited in the Vulgate; the third is sometimes
 violated, and the fourth often.

⁴² Essays on the Characteristics.

§ 3. BUT, to return to Castalio : he was not entirely disappointed in his principal aim. Many Romanists, as well as Protestants, who could not endure the foreign idioms and obscurity of the Vulgate, attracted by the fluency, the perspicuity, and partly, no doubt, by the novelty of Castalio's diction, as employed for conveying *the mind of the Spirit*, were delighted with the performance; whilst the same quality of novelty, along with what looked like affectation in the change, exceedingly disgusted others. One thing is very evident, in regard to this translator, that when his work first made its appearance, nobody seemed to judge of it with coolness and moderation. Almost every person either admired, or abhorred, it. At this distant period, there is a greater probability of judging equitably, than there was when it was first published, and men's passions, from the circumstances of the times, were, on every new topic of discussion, wherein religion was concerned, so liable to be inflamed.

§ 4. IF we examine this work by the three great ends of translating, above observed, we shall be qualified to form some judgment of his merit in this department. As to the first and principal end, conveying the true sense of his author, I think he has succeeded, at least, as well as most other translators into Latin, and better than some of those who, with much virulence, traduced his character, and decried his work. He had, indeed, one great advantage, in being an excellent linguist,

and knowing more of the three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, than most of the critics of his time. But that his immoderate passion for classical elocution, did sometimes lead him to adopt expressions which were feeble, obscure, and improper, is very certain. And it must be owned, notwithstanding his plausible defence, that Beza had reason to affirm, that the words *ἔστι ἐπεσκεψάτο καὶ ἐποίησε λυτῶσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ*⁴³, are but ambiguously and frigidly rendered, *qui populi sui liberationem procuret*. The difference is immense, between the notions of Pagans, concerning the agency of their gods in human affairs and the ideas which Scripture gives us, of the divine efficiency; and, therefore, even Cicero, in a case of this kind, is no authority. The following instance, cited by Houbigant, is an example of obscurity arising from the same cause⁴⁴: *Tu isti populo terræ hereditatem hercisceris*⁴⁵. *Hercisco* is merely a juridical term which, though it might have been proper, in a treatise on the civil law, or in pleading in a court of judicature, no Roman author, of any name, would have used; in a work intended for the people. But, to no sort of style are technical terms more unsuitable than to that of holy writ. It was the more inexcusable, in this place, where the simple and natural expression was so obvious. *Tu terram—dabis isti populo possidendam*. Whereas, the phrase which Castalio has adopted, would have probably been unintelligible to the much greater part of the people,

⁴³ Luke, i. 68.⁴⁴ Proleg.⁴⁵ Josh. i. 6.

even in Rome, at the time when Latin was their mother-tongue.

§ 5. As to the second object of translating, the conveyance of the spirit and manner of the author, in a just exhibition of the character of his style; I hinted before that, in this particular, he failed *entirely*, and, I may even add, *intentionally*. The first characteristic quality of the historic style of holy writ, *simplicity*, he has totally renounced. The simple style is opposed both to the complex, and to the highly ornamented. The complex is, when the diction abounds in periods, or in sentences consisting of several members artfully combined. This is much the manner of Castalio, but far from that of the sacred historians. In a former Dissertation⁴⁶, I gave a specimen of this difference, in his manner of rendering the first five verses of Genesis. Now, for the transformation he has made them undergo, he has no excuse, from either necessity or perspicuity. The simple style will suit any tongue, (though the complex will not always,) and is remarkably perspicuous. His affecting so often, without necessity, to give, in the way of narrative, what, in the original, is in the way of dialogue, is another flagrant violation of ancient simplicity.

Nor is simplicity alone hurt by this change. How cold and inanimate, as well as indefinite, is the oblique but classical turn, which Castalio has

⁴⁶ Diss. III. § 4.

endeavoured to give to Laban's salutation of Abraham's servant: *Eumque a Jova salvere jussum, hortatur, ne foris maneat*: compared with the direct and vivid address in the Vulgate, literally from the Hebrew: *Dixitque, Ingredere, benedicte Domini: cur foris stas?* Or, as it is in the English translation, *Come in, thou blessed of the Lord: wherefore standest thou without*⁴⁷? That he transgresses, in this respect also, by a profusion of ornament, is undeniable. By his accumulated diminutives, both in names and epithets, in the manner of Catullus, intended surely to be ornamental, he has injured the dignity, as well as the simplicity and seriousness, of Solomon's Song.

Another ornament, in the same taste, by which the simplicity of the sacred writers has been greatly hurt in his translation, is the attempt, when the same ideas recur, of expressing them almost always in different words and varied phrases. It is not only essential to the simplicity, but it adds to the majesty, of the inspired penmen, that there never appears, in them, any solicitude about their words. No pursuit of variety, or, indeed, of any thing in point of diction, out of the common road. Very different is the manner of this interpreter. I had occasion to remark before⁴⁸, that there were no fewer than seven or eight phrases, employed by Castalio, in different places of the New Testament, for expressing the import of the single verb *μετανοεω*, though used always in the same acceptation. And, as another

⁴⁷ Gen. xxiv. 31.

⁴⁸ Diss. VI. Part III. §.11.

specimen of this inordinate passion, I shall add that, to express *διωγμος*, he uses, beside the word *persequutio*, the far too general terms, *vexatio*, *afflictio*, *insectatio*, *adversa*, *res adversæ*. Nay, in some instances, his love of variety has carried him so far as to sacrifice, not barely the style of his author, but his sense. What can be a stronger example of it, than his denominating God, *Deus obtrectator*⁴⁹, rather than recur, with his author, to any term he had employed before. For the Hebrew קנא *kone*, rendered *jealous* in the English translation, he had used, in one place, *æmulus*, in another, *socii impatiens*, and in a third, *rivalis impatiens*. Though some exception may be made to the two last, the first was as good as the language afforded. Another translator would not have thought there was any occasion for a fourth; but so differently thought our classical interpreter, in matters of this kind, that he preferred a most improper word, which might contribute to give his style the graces of novelty and variety, to an apposite, but more common, term which he had employed before. The word *obtrectator* is never used, as far as I remember, but in a bad sense. It is acknowledged that, when jealousy is ascribed to God, the expression is not strictly proper. He is spoken of after the manner of men. But then the term, by itself, does not imply any thing immoral. We may say of a man properly, in certain cases, that he had reason to be *jealous*; but with

⁴⁹ Josh. xxiv. 19.

no propriety can we say, in any case, that a man had reason to be *envious*, that he had reason to be *calumnious*. These epithets are better suited to the diabolical nature, than to the divine. Yet both are included in the word *obtreceptor*.

In short, his affectation of the manner of some of the poets and orators, has metamorphosed the authors he interpreted, and stript them of the venerable signatures of antiquity, which so admirably besit them; and which, serving as intrinsic evidence of their authenticity, recommended their writings to the serious and judicious. Whereas, when accoutred in this new fashion, nobody would imagine them to have been Hebrews; and yet (as some critics have justly remarked) it has not been within the compass of Castalio's art, to make them look like Romans.

§ 6. I AM far from thinking that Castalio merited, on this account, the bitter invectives vented against him by Beza, and others, as a wilful corrupter of the word of God. His intention was good; it was to entice all ranks, as much as possible, to the study of the divine oracles. The expedient he used appeared, at least, harmless. It was, in his judgment, at the worst, but like that which Horace observes, was often practised by good-natured teachers :

Ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi
Doctores, elementa velint ut discere prima.

He regarded the thoughts solely as the result of inspiration, the words and idiom as merely circumstantial. “Erant Apostoli,” says he⁵⁰, “natu
 “Hebræi : et peregrina, hoc est Græca lingua,
 “scribentes hebraizabant ; non quod id juberet
 “spiritus : neque enim pluris facit spiritus He-
 “braismos quam Græcismos.” Indeed, if the liberty Castalio has taken with the diction, had extended no further than to reject those Hebraisms which, how perspicuous soever they are in the original, occasion either obscurity or ambiguity, when verbally translated, and to supply their place, by simple expressions, in the Latin idiom, clearly conveying the same sense, no person who is not tinctured with the cabalistical superstition of the rabbinites, could have censured his conduct.

Very often, the freedoms he used with the style of the sacred penmen, aimed no higher. Thus, the expression of the Prophet, which is, literally, in English, *My beloved had a vineyard in a horn of the son of oil* ; and which is rendered in the Vulgate, *Vinea facta est dilecto meo in cornu filio olei* ; Castalio has translated much better, because intelligibly, *Habebat amicus meus vineam in quodam pingui dorso*. Had he used the more familiar term, *collis*, instead of *dorsum*, it would have been still better. The English translation expresses the sense very properly, *My well beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill*⁵¹. But as I have shown, the freedoms taken by

⁵⁰ Defens.⁵¹ Isaiah, v. 1.

Castalio went sometimes a great deal further than this, and tended to lessen the respect due to the sacred oracles, by putting them too much on a footing with compositions merely human, and by changing their serious manner, for one comparatively light and trifling, nay, even playful and childish.

§ 7. As to the other two qualities of the historical style of Scripture, perspicuity and purity, he seems in general to have been observant of them. To the latter he is censured chiefly for having sacrificed too much. Yet his attention to this quality has proved a principal means of securing his perspicuity; as it is certain that the excessive attempts of others to preserve in their version the Oriental idiom, have both rendered the plainest passages unintelligible, and given bad Latin for what was good Hebrew or Chaldee. The example last quoted is an evidence of this; and surely none can doubt that it has more perspicuity, as well as propriety, to say in Latin, *ut nemo usque evaderet* with Castalio, than to say, *ut non fieret salva omnis caro* with the Vulgate: and, *Nulla res est quam Deus facere non possit* with the former, than *non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum* with the latter. Nevertheless, in a few instances, an immoderate passion for classical phraseology has, as we have seen, betrayed him into obscurities, and even blunders, of which inferior interpreters were in no danger.

§ 8. To illustrate the different effects on the appearance of the sacred penmen, produced by

the opposite modes of translating, which Arias and Castalio have adopted, I shall employ a similitude of which Castalio himself has given me the hint. In his epistle dedicatory to king Edward, he has these words: *Quod ad latinittatem attinet, est oratio nihil aliud quam rei quædam quasi vestis, et nos sartores sumus.* In conformity to this idea, I should say that those venerable writers the Apostles and Evangelists, appear, in their own country, in a garb plain indeed, and even homely, but grave withal, decent, and well fitted to the wearers. Arias, intending to introduce them to the Latins, has, to make them look as little as possible like other men, and, one would think, to frighten every body from desiring their acquaintance, clothed them in filthy rags, which are indeed of Roman manufacture, but have no other relation to any thing worn in the country, being alike unfit for every purpose of decency and use. For surely that style is most aptly compared to tattered garments, in which the words can, by no rule of syntax in the language, be rendered coherent, or expressive of any sense. Castalio, on the contrary, not satisfied that, when abroad, they should be gravely and properly habited, as they were at home, will have them tricked up in finery and lace, that they may appear like men of fashion, and even make some figure in, what the world calls, good company. But, though I consider both these interpreters as in extremes, I am far from thinking their performances are to be deemed, in any respect, equivalent.

It is not in my power to discover a good use that can be made of Arias' version, unless to give some assistance to a school-boy in acquiring the elements of the language. Castalio's, with one great fault, has many excellent qualities.

§ 9. IN regard to the third object of translating, which is to write so far properly and agreeably in the language into which the translation is made, as may, independently of its exactness, serve to recommend it as a valuable work in that tongue; if Castalio failed here, he has been particularly unlucky, since the latinity and elegance of the work must, by his own acknowledgment, have been more an object to him than to other translators, this being the great means by which he wanted to draw the attention of the youth of that age to the study of the holy Scriptures. But however much his taste may, in this respect, have been adapted to the times wherein he lived, we cannot consider it as perfectly chaste and faultless. Sufficient grounds for this censure may be collected from the remarks already made. The superficial and the shining qualities of style seem often to have had more attractions with him than the solid and the useful.

§ 10. IN other respects he appears to have been well qualified for the task of translating. Conversant in the learned languages, possessed of a good understanding, and no inconsiderable share of critical acuteness, candid in his disposition, and

not over-confident of his own abilities, or excessively tenacious of his own opinion, he was ever ready to hearken, and, when convinced, to submit, to reason, whether presented by a friend, or by a foe, whether in terms of amity and love, or of reproach and hatred. Of this he gave very ample evidence, in the corrections which he made, on some of the later editions of his Bible.

He was far from pretending, like some interpreters and commentators, to understand every thing. When he was uncertain about the sense, he could do no other than follow the words in translating. This expression of the Apostle Peter⁵², *Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελισθῆ, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι*, he translates in this manner, *Nam ideo mortuis quoque nunciatus est, ut et secundum homines carne judicentur et secundum Deum spiritu vivant*; adding this note on the margin: *Hunc locum non intelligo, ideoque ad verbum transtuli*. There are several other such instances. In one place he has on the margin: *Hos duos versus non intelligo, ideoque de mea translatione dubito*⁵³. It is worth while to take notice of the manner in which he himself speaks of such passages: “ Quod autem alicubi scribo, me aliquem locum
“ non intelligere: id non ita accipi volo, quasi cæ-
“ tera plane intelligam: sed ut sciatur, me in aliis
“ aliquid saltem obscuræ lucis habere, in illis
“ nihil: tum autem ut meæ translationi in

⁵² 1 Pet. iv. 6.

⁵³ Isaiah, xxvii. 6, 7.

“ quibusdam hujusmodi locis non nimium confidatur. Neque tamen ubique quid non intelligam ostendo : esset enim hoc infinitum⁵⁴.”

§ 11. WITH respect to the changes he made, in adopting classical terms instead of certain words and phrases, which had been long in use amongst ecclesiastic writers, and were supposed to be universally understood, I cannot agree entirely with, either his sentiments, or those of his adversaries. In the first place, I do not think, as he seems once to have thought (though, in this respect, he afterwards altered his conduct, and consequently, we may suppose, his opinion,) that no word deserved admission into his version, which had not the sanction of some Pagan classic. For this reason, the words *baptisma*, *angelus*, *ecclesia*, *proselytus*, *synagoga*, *propheta*, *patriarcha*, *mediator*, *dæmoniacus*, *hypocrita*, *benedictus*, and the words *fides* and *fidelis*, when used in the theological sense, he set aside for *lotio*, *genius*, *respublica*, *adventitius*, *collegium*, *vates*, *summus pater*, *sequester*, *furiosus*, *simulator*, *collaudandus*, *fiducia*, *fidens*. Some of the more usual terms, as *angelus*, *baptisma*, *ecclesia*, *synagoga*, were, in later editions, replaced. In regard to some others, considering the plan he had adopted, his choice cannot be much blamed, as they were sufficiently expressive of the sense of the original. A few, indeed, were not so.

⁵⁴ Ad lectores admonitio.

Genius is not a version of *αγγελος*, nor *furiosus* of *δαιμονιζομενος*. The notions entertained by the heathen of their *genii*, no more corresponded to the ideas of the Hebrews concerning *angels*, than the fancies which our ancestors entertained of elves and fairies, corresponded to the Christian doctrine concerning the heavenly inhabitants. *Αγγελος* was a literal version made by the Seventy into Greek, of the Hebrew מלאך *malach*, a name of office which, if Castalio after them had literally rendered into Latin, calling it *nuntius*, it would have been as little liable to exception, as his rendering the words βασιλευς and υπηρετης, *rex* and *minister*. *Furiosus* is not a just translation of *δαιμονιζομενος*. The import of the original name, which only suggests the cause, is confined, by the translator's opinion, to the nature of the disorder: *furiosus* means no more than *mad*, whereas *δαιμονιζομενος* is, repeatedly in Scripture, given as equivalent to *δαιμονιον εχων*. Nor does the disease of those unhappy persons appear to have been always *madness*. And if, in this, we regard etymology alone, the traditionary fables, about the three infernal goddesses, called *furies*, are no way suited to the ancient popular faith, of either Jews or Pagans, concerning demons. And even though *adventitius* corresponds exactly in etymology with *προσηλυτος*, the Latin word does not convey the idea which, in the Hellenistic idiom, is conveyed by the Greek. *Simulator* can hardly be objected to, as a version of *υποκριτης*. In some instances, it answers better than *hypocrita*. This name is, in Latin, confined, by use, to those who

lead a life of dissimulation in what regards religion; whereas the Greek term is sometimes employed in the New Testament, in all the latitude in which we commonly use the word *dissembler*, for one who is insincere in a particular instance. But the classical word *collaudandus* does not suit the Greek *εὐλογητός* as used in holy writ, near so well as does the ecclesiastical epithet *benedictus*. And *summus pater* is too indefinite a version of *πατριάρχης*.

It is a good rule, in every language, to take the necessary terms in every branch of knowledge or business, from those best acquainted with that branch: because, among them, the extent of the terms, and their respective differences, will be most accurately distinguished. In what, therefore, peculiarly concerned the undisputed tenets, or rites, either of Judaism or of Christianity, it was much more reasonable to adopt the style used by Latin Jews or Christians, in those early ages, before they were corrupted with philosophy, than, with the assistance of but a remote analogy, to transfer terms used by Pagan writers, to the doctrines and ceremonies of a religion with which they were totally unacquainted. I must, therefore, consider the rejection of several terms established by ecclesiastic use, and conveying precisely the idea intended by the sacred penmen, as an indication of an excessive squeamishness in point of Latinity. Such terms, in my judgment, are, in matters of revelation, entitled even to be preferred to classical words. For, though the latter may

nearly suit the idea, they cannot have, to the same degree as the former, the sanction of use in that application.

§ 12. BUT, let it be observed, on the other hand, that the preference above mentioned, is limited by this express condition, that the ecclesiastic term, in its common acceptance, plainly convey to the reader the same idea which the original word, used by the sacred penmen, was intended to convey to the readers for whom they wrote. To plead, on the contrary, with Father Simon and others, for the preferable adoption of certain theologic words and phrases consecrated by long use, as they are pleased to term it, though admitted to be obscure, ambiguous, or even improper, is to me the greatest absurdity. It is really to make the sacred authors give place to their ancient interpreters: it is to throw away the sense of the former in compliment to the words of the latter. We must surely consider inspiration as a thing of very little consequence, when we sacrifice it knowingly to human errors. This would, in effect, condemn all new translations, whatever occasion there might be for them, for correcting the faults of former versions. But into the truth of this sentiment I shall have occasion to inquire more fully afterwards. Only let it be remembered, that the limitation now mentioned affects two classes of words, first, those by which the original terms were early mis-translated; secondly, those which, though at first they exhibited the true

sense of the original, have come gradually to convey a different meaning. For these, in consequence of a change insensibly introduced in the application, are become now, whatever they were formerly, either improper or ambiguous.

There are some terms in the Vulgate which, in my judgment, were never perfectly adapted to those in the original, in whose place they were substituted. Whether *sacramentum* for *μυστηριον* were originally of this number or not, it is certain that the theological meaning, now constantly affixed to that word, does not suit the sense of the sacred authors, which is fully and intelligibly expressed in Latin, as Castalio and Houbigant have commonly done, by the word *arcanum*. The Vulgate sometimes renders it *mysterium*, which is not not much better than *sacramentum*. For *mysterium*, not being Latin, and being variously used as a technical term by theologians, must be vague and obscure. Many other latinized Greek words (as *scandalizo*, *blasphemia*, *hæresis*, *schisma*) are in some measure liable to the same objection. The original terms are none of those, which were observed formerly⁵⁵ not to be susceptible of a translation into another language. And in that case to transfer the words, leaving them untranslated, rarely fails either to keep the reader in ignorance, or to lead him into error. For this reason, I am far from condemning, with Boys, Simon, and some others, the modern translators,

⁵⁵ Diss. II. Part I. § 5.

particularly Castalio, for rendering them into proper Latin. I intend, in another Dissertation, to evince that they would not have executed faithfully the office they had undertaken, if they had not done it. The words with which Castalio has commonly supplied us, instead of those above mentioned (*officio, maledictum, or impia dicta, secta, dissidium, or factio,*) are in general as apposite for expressing the sense of the original, as any other words of the same class. And even the Vulgate is not uniform in regard to those words. *Αἰρεσις* is, in several places of that version, rendered *secta*, and *σχίσμα* *scissura* and *dissensio*. But of this I have treated already in the preceding Dissertation.

§ 13. AFTER all the zeal Castalio has shown, and the stretches he has made for preserving classical purity, could it have been imagined that he would have admitted into his version, manifest barbarisms, both words and idioms, of no authority whatever? Yet that he has afforded a few instances of this strange inconsistency, is unquestionable. It would not be easy to assign a satisfactory reason for his rejecting the term *idolum* idol, a classical word, and used by Pagans in the same meaning in which it is used by us. If it be said, that in their use, it was not accompanied with the same kind of sentiment as when used by us; as much may be affirmed with truth of *Deus, Numen*, and every word that relates to religion, which could not fail to affect differently the mind of a heathen, from the way in which it affects the

mind of a Jew or a Christian. Ought we to have different names for the Pagan deities, Jupiter, Juno, &c. because the mention of them was attended with reverence in Pagans, and with contempt in Christians?

But what shall we say of his supplying *idolum*, by a barbarism of his own, *deaster*, a word of no authority, sacred or profane? It suited the fundamental principles of his undertaking to reject *idolatra*, idolater, because, though analogically formed from a good word, it could plead only ecclesiastic use. But, by what principle, he has introduced such a monster as *deastricola*, that was never heard of before, it would be impossible to say. He could be at no loss for a proper expression. *Idolorum* or *simulacrorum cultor* would have served. He has given but too good reason, by such uncouth sounds as *deaster*, *deastricola*, and *infidens* infidel, to say that his objections lay only against the liberties in language which had been taken by others. Castalio argues against barbarisms as being obscure; surely this argument strikes more against those of his own coining, than against those (if they can be called barbarisms) which are recommended by so long continued, and so extensive, an use. For, though he should not allow the use of theologians to be perfectly good, it is surely, on those subjects, sufficient for removing the objection of obscurity. I do not see any thing, in his work, which has so much the appearance of self-conceit as this. In other respects, I find him modest and unassuming.

It has been also observed, that his idioms are not always pure. *Dominus ad cujus normam*, is not in the Latin idiom. *Norma legis* is proper, not *norma Dei*, or *norma hominis*. But this I consider as an oversight, the other as affectation.

§ 14. I SHALL add a few words on the subject of Hebraisms, which Castalio is accused of rejecting altogether. This charge he is so far from denying, that he endeavours to justify his conduct in this particular. Herein, I think, if his adversaries went too far on one side, in preferring the mere form of the expression, to the perspicuous enunciation of the sense; this interpreter went too far on the opposite side, as he made no account of giving to his version the strong signatures which the original bears of the antiquity, the manners, and the character, of the age and nation of the writers. Yet both the credibility of the narrative, and the impression which the sentiments are adapted to make on the readers, are not a little affected by that circumstance. That those are in the worse extreme of the two, who would sacrifice perspicuity and propriety (in other words, the sense itself) to that circumstance, is not indeed to be doubted. The patrons of the literal method do not advert that, by carrying the point too far, the very exhibition of the style and manner of the author, is, with both the other ends of translating, totally annihilated. “Quo pertinent,” says Houbigant⁵⁶, “istiusmodi interpre-

⁵⁶ Proleg.

“ tationes, quæ nihil quidquam resonant, nisi
 “ adhibes interpretis alterum interpretem ?” Again,
 “ Num proprietas hæc censenda est, quæ mihi
 “ exprimat obscure ac inhumane, id quod sacri
 “ scriptores dilucide ac liberaliter expresserunt ?”
 The sentiments of this author, in regard to the
 proper mean between both extremes, as they
 seem entirely reasonable, and equally applicable
 to any language (though expressed in reference to
 Latin versions only,) I shall subjoin to the fore-
 going observations on Castalio : “ Utroque in
 “ genere tam metrico quam soluto, retinendas
 “ esse veteres loquendi formas, nec ab ista linea
 “ unquam discedendum, nisi gravibus de causis,
 “ quæ quidem nobis esse tres videntur : primo, si
 “ Hebraismi veteres, cum retinentur, fiunt Latino
 “ in sermone, vel obscuri vel ambigui ; secundo,
 “ si eorum significantia minuitur, nisi circuitione
 “ quadam uteris ; tertio, si vergant ad aliam, quam
 “ Hebraica verba, sententiam ⁵⁷.”

§ 15. I SHALL finish my critique on this trans-
 lator, with some remarks on a charge brought
 against him by Beausobre and Lenfant, who af-
 firm ⁵⁸ that, abstracting from the false elegance of
 his style, he takes greater liberty (they must cer-
 tainly mean with the sense) than a faithful inter-
 preter ought to take. Of this his version of the
 following passage ⁵⁹ is given as an example. *Tou*

⁵⁷ Ibidem.

⁵⁸ Preface Generale, P. II. des Versions du N. T.

⁵⁹ Acts, xxvi. 18.

επιστρεψαι απο σκοτους εις φως, και της εξουσιας του Σατανα επι τον Θεον, του λαβειν αυτους αφεσιν αμαρτιων, και κληρον εν τοις ηγιασμενοις, πιστει τη εις εμε ; which is thus translated by Castalio : “ Ut ex tenebris in lucem, et ex Satanæ potestate
 “ ad Deum se convertant., et ita peccatorum veni-
 “ am, et eandem cum iis sortem consequantur, qui
 “ fide mihi habenda sancti facti fuerint :” and by Beza, whom they here oppose to him : “ Et con-
 “ vertas eos a tenebris ad lucem, et a potestate
 “ Satanæ ad Deum, ut remissionem peccatorum et
 “ sortem inter sanctificatos accipiant per fidem
 “ quæ est in me.” In my opinion there is a real ambiguity in the original, which if Castalio be blameable for fixing, in one way, Beza is not less blameable for fixing, it, in another. The words *πιστει τη εις εμε*, may be construed with the verb *λαβειν* at some distance, or with the participle *ηγιασμενοις*, immediately preceding. In the common way of reckoning, if one of these methods were to be styled a stretch, or a liberty, it would be Beza’s, and not Castalio’s ; both because the latter keeps closer to the arrangement of the original, and because the Apostle, not having used the adjective *αγιοις* but the participle *ηγιασμενοις*, gives some ground to regard the following words as its regimen. Accordingly, Beza has considered the version of Erasmus, which is to the same purpose with Castalio’s, and with which the Tigurine version also agrees ; “ ut accipiant remissionem peccatorum, et sortem inter eos qui sanctificati sunt, per fidem quæ est erga me ;” as exhibiting a sense quite different from his own ;

at the same time, he freely acknowledges, that the original is susceptible of either meaning. “*Τη πιστει. Potest quidem hoc referri ad participium ἡγιασμενοι, quemadmodum retulit Erasmus.*” In this instance, Beza, though not remarkable for moderation, has judged more equitably than the French translators above mentioned, who had no reason to affirm, dogmatically, that the words ought to be joined in the one way, and not in the other; or to conclude that Castalio affected to give the words this turn, in order to exclude the idea of *absolute election*. Did the English translators, for this purpose, render the passage after Erasmus and Castalio, not after Beza, *That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me?* Nobody, I dare say, will suspect it.

I cannot help thinking those critics unlucky in their choice of an example: for had there been more to say, in opposition to this version of the passage, than has yet been urged, it would still have been hard to treat that as a liberty peculiar to Castalio, in which he was evidently not the first, and in which he has had the concurrence of more translators, than can be produced on the other side. For my part, as I acknowledge that such transpositions are not unfrequent in holy writ, my opinion is, that the connection and scope of the place ought chiefly to determine us in doubtful cases. In the present case, it appears to me to yield the clearest sense, and to be every way the most eligible, to join the words *πιστει τη εις εμε*, neither to *ἡγιασμενοι*, nor to *λαβειν*, but to the fore-

going verb *επιστρεψαι*; for when the regimen is thrown to the end of the sentence, it is better to join it to the first verb, with which it can be suitably construed, than to an intermediate verb, explicative of the former. Nothing can give a more plain, or a more apposite, meaning, than the words under examination, thus construed; *To bring them by the faith that is in me* (that is, by my doctrine, the faith, *ἡ πίστις* being often used by the sacred writers for the object of faith, or *thing believed*,) *from darkness to light, &c.*

§ 16. THUS, I have endeavoured to examine, with impartiality, Castalio's character as a translator, without assuming the province of either the accuser or the apologist. I have neither exaggerated, nor extenuated, either his faults or his virtues, and can pronounce truly, upon the whole, that though there are none (Arias and Pagnin excepted,) whose general manner of translating is more to be disapproved; I know not any by which a student may be more assisted in attaining the true sense of many places, very obscure in most translations, than by Castalio's.

PART V.

STRICTURES ON BEZA.

BEZA, the celebrated Geneva translator of the New Testament, cannot be accused of having gone to either of the extremes in which we find Arias and Castalio. In general, he is neither servilely literal, barbarous, and unintelligible, with the former; nor does he appear ashamed of the unadorned simplicity of the original, with the latter. It was, therefore, at first, my intention not to criticise his version, no more than to inquire into the manner of all the Latin translators of sacred writ, but barely to point out the most egregious faults in the plan of translating sometimes adopted, specifying, in the way of example and illustration, those versions only, wherein such faults were most conspicuous. On more mature reflection, I have judged it proper to bestow a few thoughts on Beza, as his translation has, in a great measure, been made the standard of most of the translations of the reformed churches (I do not include the Lutheran) into modern tongues. He has, perhaps, had less influence on the English translators, than on those of other countries; but he has not been entirely without influence,

even on them. And, though he writes with a good deal of purity and clearness, without florid and ostentatious ornaments; there are some faults, which it is of great moment to avoid, and with which he is, upon the whole, more chargeable, than any other translator of the New Testament I know.

§ 2. His version of the New Testament is nearly in the same taste with that of the Old, by Junius and Tremellius, but better executed. These two translations are commonly bound together, to complete the version of holy writ. Junius and Tremellius have been accused of obtruding upon the sacred text, a number of pronouns, *ille*, *hic*, and *iste*, for which the original gives no warrant. Their excuse was, that the Latin has not articles, as the Hebrew, and that there is no other way of supplying the articles, but by pronouns. But it may, with reason, be questioned, whether it were not better, except in a few cases, to leave them unsupplied, than to substitute what may darken the expression, and even render it more indefinite, nay, what may sometimes alter the sense. At the same time, I acknowledge that there are cases in which this method is entirely proper. In the edition of an emphatic epithet, the article is fitly supplied by the pronoun. Thus the words, *Επεσε Βαβυλων η πολις η μεγαλη*⁶⁰, are justly translated by Beza, *Cecidit Babylon urbs illa magna*: and the ex-

⁶⁰ Rev. xiv, 8.

pression used by Nathan to David, *Thou art the man*⁶¹, is properly rendered by Junius, *Tu vir ille es*. The necessity of recurring to the pronoun, in these instances, has been perceived also by the old translator and Castalio.

Nor are these the only cases wherein the Greek or Hebrew article may, not only in Latin, but even in English, which has articles, be rendered properly by the pronoun. For example, a particular species is distinguished from others of the same genus, by some attributive conjoined with it; but when the occasion of mentioning that species soon recurs, the attributive is sufficiently supplied by the article; and, in such instances, it often happens, that the article is best supplied, in another language, by the pronoun. In the question put to our Lord, *Τι αγαθον ποιησω, ινα εχω ζωην αιωνιον*⁶², a species of life to which the question relates, is distinguished from all others, by the epithet *αιωνιον*. The article would contribute nothing here to the distinction. But when, in the answer⁶³, the same subject is referred to, the epithet is dropped, and the article is prefixed to *ζωην*, which ascertains the meaning with equal perspicuity. *Ει δε θελεις εισελθειν εις την ζωην*. I have seen no Latin translation, no not Beza's, which renders it, *Si vis in vitam illam ingredi*; and yet it is evident, that such is, in this passage, the force of the article. The English idiom rarely permits us to give articles to abstract nouns. For this reason, it would not be a just expression of the

⁶¹ 2 Sam. xii. 7.

⁶² Matth. xix. 16.

⁶³ 17.

sense to say, *If thou wouldst enter into the life*, to wit, *eternal life*, the life inquired about. Our only way of marking the reference to the question, is by saying, *If thou wouldst enter into that life*. As, in French, the article is, on the contrary, added to all abstract nouns, the pronoun is equally necessary with them as with us, for making the distinction. There is, besides, something like an impropriety in saying to the living, *If thou wouldst enter into life*.

But there are, unquestionably, cases in which the Genevese interpreters employ the pronoun unnecessarily, awkwardly, and even improperly. *In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book*⁶⁴, say the English translators. *Audient die illa surdi isti verba literarum*, say Junius and his associate. Any person who understands Latin, on hearing the verse read by itself, will suppose that there must have been mention of some deaf persons in the foregoing verses, to which the pronoun *isti*, in this verse, has a reference. But, on inquiry, he will find there is no such thing; and that it is deaf persons in general of whom the Prophet speaks. The introduction of the pronoun, therefore, serves only to mislead. *Matthæus ille publicanus*⁶⁵, in Beza's version, evidently suggests, that Matthew was a man famous as a publican, before he became an Apostle. Though our language has articles, the Geneva England interpreters have here copied Beza so servilely as to say, *Matthew that publican*. This manner, in

⁶⁴ Isaiah, xxix. 18.

⁶⁵ Matth. x. 3.

some places, not only appears awkward, but injures the simplicity of the style. Junius says, in his account of the creation, *Dixit Deus, Esto lux, et fuit lux; viditque Deus lucem hanc esse bonam: et distinctionem fecit Deus inter hanc lucem et tenebras*⁶⁶. Here, I think, the pronoun is not only unnecessary and affected, but suggests something ridiculous, as if that light only had been distinguished from darkness. However, as *lux* is first mentioned, without an attendant, the pronoun which attends it, when mentioned afterwards, does not make the expression so indefinite and obscure as in the former example. But, when Beza makes the Evangelist say⁶⁷, *Jonas genuit Jechoniam in transportatione illa Babylonica; post autem transportationem illam Babylonicam, Jechonias genuit Salathielem*; what more is expressed, in relation to the period, than if he had said simply, *in transportatione Babylonica, et post transportationem Babylonicam*? The addition of this epithet makes the noun sufficiently definite, without any pronoun. Nay, does not the pronoun, thus superadded, suggest one of two things; either that the transportation, here referred to, had been mentioned in the preceding words, or that the historian meant to distinguish, out of several transportations, one more noted than the rest? Now, neither of these was the case: no mention had been made before, of the Babylonian transportation; and there were not more Babylonian transportations, or

⁶⁶ Gen. i. 3, 4.⁶⁷ Matth. i. 11, 12

more transportations any whither, than one which the Jewish nation had undergone. With this fault Erasmus also is chargeable, but much seldomer. Greek, as well as Hebrew, has an article, and so have modern languages. But, in translating out of these into Latin, nobody, I believe, has ever, either before or since, thought of making the pronoun supply the article, except in a few special instances, such as those above excepted. In such instances, I acknowledge, there is an evident propriety.

§ 3. BEZA, with natural talents considerably above the middle rate, had a good deal of learning, and understood well both Greek and Latin; but he neither knew Hebrew (though he had the assistance of some who knew it,) nor does he seem to have been much conversant in the translation of the Seventy. Hence it has happened, that his critical acuteness is not always so well directed as it might have been. The significations of words and idioms are often determined by him from classical authority, which might, with greater ease and more precision, have been ascertained by the usage of the sacred writers, and their ancient interpreters. As to words which do not occur in other Greek writers, or but rarely, or in a sense manifestly different from what they bear in Scripture, Beza's chief aid was etymology. This has occasioned his frequent recourse, without necessity, to circumlocution, to the prejudice always of the diction; and sometimes of the sense. Examples

of this we have in his manner of rendering *σπλαγχνιζομαι*⁶⁸, *κληρονομεω*⁶⁹, *πληροφορεω*⁷⁰, *συκοφαντεω*⁷¹, *χειροτονεω*⁷², and several others. On the last of these, I shall soon have occasion to make some remarks. For the other four, I shall only refer to my notes on those passages in the Gospels, where they occur as marked in the margin. It is, no doubt, to this attempt at tracing the origin of the words in his version, that he alludes in that expression, *Verborum proprietatem studiose sum sectatus*⁷³. This, however, has been shown not to be always the surest method of attaining the signification wanted⁷⁴.

§ 4. BUT of all the faults with which Beza is chargeable as a translator, the greatest is, undoubtedly, that he was too violent a party-man to possess that impartiality, without which it is impossible to succeed as an interpreter of holy writ. It requires but a very little of a critical eye to discern in him a constant effort to accommodate the style of the sacred writers to that of his sect. Nay, what he has done in this way, is done so openly, I might have said avowedly, that it is astonishing it has not more discredited his work.

In this particular, as in the application of the pronouns above mentioned, Junius and Tremellius

⁶⁸ Matth. ix. 36.

⁶⁹ Matth. v. 5.

⁷⁰ Luke, i. 1.

⁷¹ Luke, xix. 8.

⁷² Acts, xiv. 23.

⁷³ Epist. ad Elis. Reg. Angel.

⁷⁴ Diss. IV. § 15, &c.

have also justly fallen under the animadversion of all impartial judges. What is thus well expressed in the English translation, *They gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading*⁷⁵, is rendered, by these interpreters, *Exponendo sensum dabant intelligentiam* PER SCRIPTURAM IPSAM. The three last words are an evident interpolation. There is no ellipsis in the sentence : they are no way necessary ; for the sense is complete without them. But with them it is most unwarrantably limited to express the private opinion of the translators. I am as zealously attached as any man, to the doctrine that Scripture will ever be found its own best interpreter ; an opinion which I have considered in a former Dissertation⁷⁶, and which is sufficiently supported by the principles of sound criticism, and common sense. But no person can detest more strongly a method of defending even a true opinion, so unjustifiable as that of foisting it into the sacred Scriptures. If any thing can serve to render a just sentiment questionable, it is the detection of such gross unfairness, in the expedients employed for promoting it. Yet this has been copied into the Geneva French version, after it had received the corrections of Bertram, by whom it has been made to say, *Ils en donnoient l'intelligence, la faisant entendre par l'écriture meme.* It is but just to observe, that neither Olivetan the translator, nor Calvin, who afterwards revised his work, had discovered

⁷⁵ Neh. viii. 3.⁷⁶ Diss. II. Part II.

any warrant for the last clause in the original, or had admitted it into the version.

The insertion of this comment has here this additional bad consequence, that it misleads the reader in regard to the exposition meant by the sacred penman. Who would not conclude, from the version of Junius, that Ezra, or some of the Levites who attended, after reading a portion of Scripture, pronounced an explanatory discourse (such as in some Christian societies is called a lecture) on the passage. Whereas the whole import appears to be that, as the people, after the captivity, did not perfectly understand the ancient Hebrew, in which the law was written, this judicious teacher found it expedient, by himself or others, to interpret what was read, one paragraph after another, into that dialect of Chaldee which was current among them; a practice long after continued in the synagogue, and not improbably, as learned men have thought, that which gave rise to the *targums* or paraphrases, in that tongue, extant to this day.

I do not remember a passage wherein Beza has gone quite so far, as Junius and Tremellius have presumed to do in this instance; but that he has shown throughout the whole work, a manifest partiality to the theology then prevalent in Geneva, is beyond a doubt. I shall select a few examples out of a much greater number, which might be brought.

§ 5. THE first shall be from that celebrated discourse of our Lord's, commonly called his sermon

on the mount, wherein these words, *ηκουσατε ουτι ερρεθη τοις αρχαιοις*⁷⁷, are always rendered, *Audistis dictum fuisse a veteribus*; in contradiction to all the versions which had preceded, Oriental and Occidental, and in opposition to the uniform idiom of the sacred writers. [See the note on that passage in this version.] Beza does not hesitate in his annotations to assign his reason, which is drawn not from any principle of criticism, not from a different reading in any ancient manuscripts, of which he had several, but professedly from the fitness of this version for supporting his own doctrine. “*Præstat τοις αρχαιοις explicare quasi scriptum sit υπο των αρχαιων (ut sic notentur synagogæ doctores, jampridem sic docentes, qui solebant patrum et majorum nomina suis falsis interpretationibus prætexere) quam ad auditores referre.*” But this correction of the ancient version was every way unsuitable, and the expedient weak. It was essential to the Phari- saical notion of traditions, to consider them as precepts which God himself had given to their fathers verbally, and which were therefore called the *oral* law, in contradistinction to the *written* law, or the Scriptures. Consequently Beza’s representation of their presumption is far short of the truth. He ought to have said, *Qui solebant* (not *patrum et majorum nomina*, but) *Dei nomen* (for the fact is indubitable) *suis falsis interpretationibus prætexere*. And let it be observed, that our Lord does not here give any sanction to their

⁷⁷ Matth. v. 21. 27. 33.

distinction of the law, into *oral*, and *written*. He does not once say, *It was said to the ancients*, but uniformly, *Ye have heard that it was said*. He speaks not of what God did, but of what they pretended that he did.

His words, therefore, and the doctrine of the Pharisees, are alike misrepresented by this bold interpreter; and that for the sake of an advantage, merely imaginary, against an adverse sect. The one interpretation is not more favourable to the Socinians than the other. But, if it had been otherwise, no person will consider that as a good reason for misrepresenting, unless he is more solicitous of accommodating Scripture to his sentiments, than of accommodating his sentiments to Scripture. The former has indeed been but too common with interpreters, though with few so much, and so barefacedly, as with Beza. I am sorry to add that, in the instance we have been considering, Beza has been followed by most of the Protestant translators of his day, Italian, French, and English.

§ 6. THE following is another example of the strong inclination which this translator had, even in the smallest matters, to make his version conformable to his own prepossessions. He renders these words, *συν γυναιξει*⁷⁸, though, without either article or pronoun, *cum uxoribus*, as though the expression had been *συν ταις γυναιξιν αυτων*. In this manner he excuses himself in the notes:

⁷⁸ Acts, i. 14.

“ Conveniebat apostolorum etiam uxores confir-
 “ mari, quas vel peregrinationis illorum comites
 “ esse oportebat, vel eorum absentiam domi pa-
 “ tienter expectare.” Very well: and because
 Theodore Beza judges it to have been convenient
 that the Apostles’ wives, for their own confirma-
 tion, should be there, he takes the liberty to make
 the sacred historian say that they were there,
 when, in fact, he does not so much as insinuate
 that there were any wives among them. The use
 of the Greek word *γυνή* is entirely similar to that
 of the French word *femme*. Nobody that under-
 stands French would translate *avec les femmes*
 with the *wives*, but with the *women*, whereas the
 proper translation of *avec leurs femmes* is, *with
 their wives*.

It is impossible for one who knows the state of
 things, at the time when that version was made,
 not to perceive the design of this misinterpreta-
 tion. The Protestant ministers, amongst whom
 marriage was common, were exposed to much
 obloquy among the Romanists, through the absurd
 prejudices of the latter, in favour of celibacy. It
 was, therefore, deemed of great consequence to
 the party, to represent the Apostles as married
 men. But, could one imagine that this considera-
 tion would have weight enough to lead a man of
 Beza’s abilities and character into such a flagrant,
 though not very material mistranslation? A trans-
 lator ought surely to express the full meaning of
 his author, as far as the language which he writes
 is capable of expressing it. But here there is an

evident restriction of his author's meaning. The remark of the canon of Ely is unanswerable: "Qui mulieres dicit, uxores etiam sub eadem appellatione comprehendere potest. At qui uxores nominat, solas illas nominat.—Igitur quo generalior eo tutior erit, et Græcis convenientior interpretatio." Besides, there may have been, for aught we know, no wives in the company, in which case Beza's words include a direct falsehood. And this falsehood he boldly puts into the mouth of the sacred penman. We know that Peter had once a wife, as we learn from the Gospel, that his wife's mother was cured by Jesus of a fever⁷⁹. But whether she was living at the time referred to in the Acts, or whether any more of the Apostles were married, or whether their wives were disciples, we know not. Now this falsification, though in a little matter, is strongly characteristic of that interpreter. I am glad to add, that in this he has been deserted by all the Protestant translators I know.

A similar instance the very next chapter presents us with⁸⁰. The words, *ουκ εγκαταλειπεις την ψυχην μου εις αδου*, he translates, *Non derelinques cadaver meum in sepulcro*, not only rendering *αδης sepulcrum*, according to an opinion which, though shown above⁸¹, to be ill-founded, is pretty common; but *ψυχη cadaver*, carcase, wherein, I believe, he is singular. His motive is still of the same

⁷⁹ Matth. viii. 14, 15. *

⁸⁰ Acts, ii. 27.

⁸¹ Diss. VI. Part II. § 4, &c.

kind. The common version, though unexceptionable, might be thought to support the Popish limbo. “Quod autem annotavi ex vetere versione “*animam meam* natum esse errorem, ac propterea “me maluisse aliud nomen usurpare, non temere “feci, cum hunc præcipue locum a Papistis tor- “queri ad suum limbum constituendum videamus, “et veteres etiam inde descensum illum animæ “Christi ad inferos excogitarint⁸².”

This specimen from Beza, it may be thought, should have been overlooked, because, though inserted in the first, it was corrected in the subsequent editions of his version. This, I confess, was my own opinion, till I observed, that in the annotations of those very editions, he vindicates his first translation of the words, and acknowledges that he had altered it, not from the conviction of an error, but to gratify those who, without reason, were, through ignorance of the Latin idiom, dissatisfied with the manner in which he had first rendered it. “In priore nostra editione,” says he⁸³, “recte interpretatus eram, NON DERELIN- “QUES CADAVER, &c. quod tamen nunc mutavi, ut “iis obsequar, qui conquesti sunt me a Græcis “verbis discessisse, et nomine *cadaveris* (inscitia “certe potius Latini sermonis quam recto ullo ju- “dicio) offenduntur.”

To Beza’s reason for rejecting the common version, Castalio retorts, very justly, that if the possibility of wresting a passage in support of error,

⁸² Bezae Resp. ad Cast.

⁸³ Bezae Annotationes, ed. 1598.

were held a good reason for translating it otherwise, Beza's own version of the passage in question, would be more exceptionable than what he had pretended to correct. "Deinde non minus ex ejus translatione possit error nasci, et quidem longe perniciosior. Cum enim animam Christi vertat in cadaver, periculum est ne quis animam Christi putet nihil fuisse nisi cadaver⁸⁴." And even this opinion, which denies that Jesus Christ had a human soul, has not been unexampled. It was maintained by Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, in the third century. But, on this strange principle of Beza's, where is the version of any part of Scripture in which we could safely acquiesce?

§ 7. A THIRD example of the same undue bias (for I reckon not the last, because corrected, whatever was the motive) we have in his version of these words, *Χειροτονησαντες δε αυτοις πρεσβυτεροους*⁸⁵, which he renders *Quumque ipsi per suffragia creassent presbyteros*. The word *χειροτονησαντες*, he translates from etymology, a manner which, as was observed before, he sometimes uses. *Χειροτονειν* literally signifies, *to stretch out the hand*. From the use of this manner, in popular elections, it came to denote *to elect*, and thence, again, *to nominate*, or appoint any how. Now Beza, that his intention might not escape us, tells us in the note, "Est notanda vis hujus verbi, ut Paulum ac Barnabam sciamus nil privato arbi-

⁸⁴ Cast. Defen. adversarii Errores.

⁸⁵ Acts, xiv. 23.

“trio gessisse, nec ullam in ecclesia exercuisse
 “tyrannidem : nil denique tale fecisse quale hodie
 “Romanus papa et ipsius asseclæ, quos ordinarios
 “vocant.” Now, though no man is more an enemy to ecclesiastic tyranny than I am, I would not employ against it weapons borrowed from falsehood and sophistry. I cannot help, therefore, declaring, that the version which the Vulgate has given of that passage, *Et quum constituissent illis presbyteros*, fully expresses the sense of the Greek, and, consequently, that the words *per suffragia*, are a mere interpolation, for the sake of answering a particular purpose. It was observed before⁸⁶, that use, where it can be discovered, must determine the signification, in preference to etymology. And here we are at no loss to affirm that *χειροτονεω*, whatever were its origin, is not confined to electing, or constituting, by a plurality of voices.

But, whatever be in this, in the instance before us, the *χειροτονησαντες*, or electors, were no more than Paul and Barnabas ; and it could not, with any propriety, be said of two, that they elected by a majority of votes ; since there can be no doubt that they must have both agreed in the appointment : and if it had been the disciples, and not the two Apostles who had given their suffrages, it would have been of the disciples, and of them only, not of the Apostles, that the term *χειροτονησαντες* could have been used, which the construc-

⁸⁶ Diss. IV. § 15, &c.

tion of the sentence manifestly shows that it is not. The sense of the word here given by Beza, is therefore totally unexampled; for, according to him, it must signify not *to elect*, but *to constitute those whom others have elected*. For, if this be not what he means by *per suffragia creassent*, applied to no more than two, it will not be easy to divine his meaning, or to discover in what manner it answered the purpose expressed in his note. And if this be what he means, he has given a sense to the word, for which I have not seen an authority from any author, sacred or profane. The common import of the word is no more than to constitute, ordain, or appoint any how, by election, or otherwise, by one, two, or more. When it is by election, it is solely from the scope of the passage that we must collect it. In the only other place⁸⁷ where it occurs in the New Testament, it no doubt relates to a proper election. But it is from the words immediately connected, *χειροτονηθεις ὑπο των εκκλησιων*, we learn, that this is the sense there, as it is from the words immediately connected that we learn, with equal certainty, that it relates here to an appointment made by two persons only.

The word occurs once in composition with the preposition *προ*. *Αλλα μαρτυσι τοις προκεχειροτονημενοις ὑπο του Θεου*⁸⁸, rendered by Beza himself, *sed testibus quos ipse prius designaverat*. Here there can be no question that it refers to a destination, of which God alone is the author, and

⁸⁷ 2 Cor. viii. 19.

⁸⁸ Acts, x. 41.

in which, therefore, there could be no suffrages. For even Beza will not be hardy enough to pretend, that such is the force of this verb, as to show, that God did nothing but by common consent, and only destined those whom others had elected. That the word *χειροτονεω* was commonly used in all the latitude here assigned to it, Dr. Hammond has, from Philo, Josephus, and Pagan writers of undoubted authority, given the amplest evidence in his Commentary.

But, so great was the authority of Beza with the Protestant translators, who favoured the model of Geneva, that his exposition of this passage, however singular, was generally adopted. Diodati says, still more explicitly, *E dopo ch' ebbero loro ordinati PER VOTI COMUNI, degli antiani.* The French, *Et apres que PAR L'AVIS DES ASSEMBLEES, ils eurent etabli des anciens.* The English Geneva Bible, *And when they had ordained them elders* BY ELECTION: The words in these versions, distinguished by the character, are those which, after Beza's example, are interpolated. In the English translation, these words are discarded. Our translators did not concur in sentiments with the Genevese, at least, in this article.

§ 3. AGAIN, that he might avoid every expression which appeared to favour the doctrine of universal redemption, the words of the Apostle, concerning God, *Ὅς παντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι*⁸⁹, literally rendered in the Vulgate, *Qui omnes ho-*

⁸⁹ 1 Tim. ii. 4.

mines vult salvos fieri, he translates, *Qui quosvis homines vult servari*⁹⁰. A little after, in the same chapter⁹¹, ‘Ο δους ‘εαυτον αντιλυτρον ‘υπερ παντων, in the Vulgate *Qui dedit redemptionem semetipsum pro omnibus*. Beza makes *Qui sese ipse dedit redemptionis pretium pro quibusvis*. Once more, in another place of this Epistle, ‘Ος εστι σωτηρ παντων ανθρωπων, μαλιστα πιστων⁹², in the Vulgate, *Qui est salvator omnium hominum, maxime fidelium*; Beza renders, *Qui est conservator omnium hominum, maxime vero fidelium*. Let it be observed, that this is the only place, in his version, where σωτηρ is rendered *conservator*, preserver: in every other passage but one, where he uses a periphrasis, the word is *servator*, answering to *salvator*, in the Vulgate, *saviour*. If it had not been for the annexed clause, μαλιστα πιστων, Beza,

⁹⁰ In the same manner he renders these words [Tit. ii. 11.] *Επεφανη γαρ η χαρις του Θεου η σωτηριος πασιν ανθρωποις*, “*Illuxit enim gratia illa Dei salutifera quibusvis [not omnibus] hominibus.*” No modern translation that I am acquainted with follows Beza in his interpretation of this verse. The Geneva French says, *Car la grace de Dieu salutaire a tous hommes, est clairement apparue*. The Geneva English, *For that grace of God that bringeth salvation unto all men, hath appeared*. The translators of the version in common use, have considered *πασιν ανθρωποις* as governed by *επεφανη*, and not by *σωτηριος*, rendering it, *For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men*. Of this version the original is evidently capable. Diodati has done still better in retaining the ambiguity. *Percioche e apparita la gratia di Dio salutare a tutti gli huomini*.

⁹¹ 1 Tim. ii. 6.

⁹² 1 Tim. iv. 10.

I suppose, would have retained the word *servator*, and had recourse to the expedient he had used repeatedly for eluding the difficulty, by saying, *Servator quorumvis hominum*. But he perceived, that *παντων ανθρωπων* must be here taken in the most comprehensive sense, being contradistinguished to *πιστων*. I do not mean, by these remarks, to affirm, whether or not the word *conservator* be equivalent to the import of the original term, as used in this place. It is enough for my purpose that, as this difference of meaning does not necessarily result, either from the words in immediate connection, or from the purport of the Epistle, no person is entitled to alter the expression, in order to accommodate it to his own opinions.

An exact counterpart to this is the manner in which an anonymous English translator has rendered these words of our Lord, *Το περι πολλων εκχυννομενον εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων*⁹³, *which is shed for mankind, for the remission of sins*; defending himself in a note, by observing, that “*πολλοι* is “frequently used for ALL.” Admit it were. The common acceptance of the word is doubtless *many*, and not *all*. And if no good reason for departing from the common meaning can be alleged, either from the words in construction, or from the scope of the passage, it ought to remain unchanged: otherwise, all dependence on translations, except for the theological system of the translator, is destroyed. Of the conduct of

⁹³ Matth. xxvi. 28.

both translators, in these instances, though acting in support of opposite opinions, the error is the same. And the plea which vindicates this writer, will equally vindicate Beza, and the plea which vindicates Beza, will equally vindicate this writer. The analogy of the faith, that is, the conformity to his particular system, is the genuine plea of each.

The safest and the fairest way for a translator is, in every disputable point, to make no distinction where the divine Spirit has not distinguished. To apply to this the words used by Boys, in a similar case, “*Cur enim cautiores simus, magisque “religiosi quam Spiritus Sanctus? Si Spiritus Sanctus non dubitavit dicere παντας et σωτηρ, cur nos “vereamur dicere omnes et servator?”* In the same manner would I expostulate with certain divines amongst ourselves, who, I have observed, in quoting the preceding passages of Scripture, never say, *would have all men to be saved, and; the Saviour of all men*, but invariably, *all sorts of men*; charitably intending, by this prudent correction, to secure the unwary from being seduced, by the latitudinarian expressions of the Apostle. If this be not being *wise above what is written*, I know not what is. In the first and second passages quoted, I know no translator who has chosen to imitate Beza; in the third, he is followed by the Geneva French only, who says *Le conservateur de tous hommes*. But it is proper to add, that it was not so in that version, till it had undergone a second or third revisal: for the corrections have not been all for the better.

§ 9. FURTHER, the words *χαρακτηρ της ὑποστασεως αυτου*⁹⁴, rendered in the Vulgate, *figura substantiæ ejus*, he has translated, *character personæ illius*. My only objection here is, to his rendering *ὑποστασις personâ*. However much this may suit the scholastic style, which began to be introduced into theology in the fourth century, it by no means suits the idiom of a period so early as that in which the books of the New Testament were written. It is of real consequence to scriptural criticism, not to confound the language of the sacred penmen with that of the writers of the fourth, or any subsequent, century. The change in style was gradual, but, in process of time, became very considerable. There was scarcely a new controversy started, which did not prove the source of new terms and phrases, as well as of new or unusual applications of the old. The word *ὑποστασις* occurs four times in the New Testament, but in no other place is it rendered *person*. It occurs often in the Septuagint, but it is never the version of a Hebrew word which can be rendered *person*. Jerom, though he lived when the Sabellian and Arian controversies were fresh in the minds of men, did not discover any reason to induce him to change the word *substantia*, which he found in the former version, called the Italic. I take notice of this, principally (for I acknowledge that the expression is obscure, either way rendered) on

⁹⁴ Heb. i. 3.

account of the manner wherein Beza defends his version. “ Quominus *substantiam* interpretarer, “ eo sum adductus, quod videam plerosque ὑπο-
 “ *στασιν* hoc loco pro *ουσια* esse interpretatos, pe-
 “ rinde ac si inter *essentiam* et *substantiam* nihil
 “ interesset—Deinde hoc etiam commodi habet
 “ ista interpretatio quod hypostases adversus Sa-
 “ bellium aperte distinguit, et το ὁμοουσιον con-
 “ firmat adversus Arianos.” Here we have a man
 who, in effect, acknowledges that he would not
 have translated some things in the way he has
 done, if it were not that he could thereby strike a
 severer blow against some adverse sect, or ward
 off a blow, which an adversary might aim against
 him. Of these great objects he never loses sight.
 Accordingly, the controvertist predominates
 throughout his whole version, as well as commen-
 tary; the translator is, in him, but a subordinate
 character; insomuch that he may justly be called
 what Jerom calls Aquila, *contensiosus interpres*.

I own, indeed, that my ideas on this subject are
 so much the reverse of Beza's, that I think a
 translator is bound to abstract from, and as far as
 possible, forget, all sects and systems, together
 with all the polemic jargon which they have been
 the occasion of introducing. His aim ought to be
 invariably to give the untainted sentiments of the
 author, and to express himself in such a manner
 as men would do, or (which is the same thing) as
 those men actually did, amongst whom such dis-
 putes had never been agitated. In this last

example, Beza is followed by the French and the English translators, but not by the Italian.

§ 10. AGAIN, in the same Epistle it is said, 'Ο δε δικαιος εκ πιστεως ζησεται και εαν υποστειληται, ουκ ευδοκει η ψυχη μου εν αυτω⁹⁵. In the Vulgate, rightly, *Justus autem meus ex fide vivet : quod si subtraxerit se, non placebit animæ meæ*. In Beza's version, *Justus autem ex fide vivet ; at si quis se subduxerit, non est gratum animo meo*. Here we have two errors. First, the word *quis* is, to the manifest injury of the meaning, foisted into the text. Yet there can be no pretence of necessity, as there is no ellipsis in the sentence. By the Syntactic order 'ο δικαιος is understood as the nominative to 'υποστειληται ; the power of the personal pronoun being, in Greek and Latin, sufficiently expressed by the inflexion of the verb. Secondly, the consequent displeasure of God is transferred from the person to the action ; *non est gratum* ; as though εν αυτω could be explained otherwise than as referring to δικαιος. This perversion of the sense is, in my judgment, so gross, as fully to vindicate from undue severity, the censure pronounced by bishop Pearson⁹⁶. *Illæ verba a Theodoro Beza haud bona fide sunt translata*. But this is one of the many passages in which this interpreter has judged that the sacred penmen, having expressed themselves incautiously,

⁹⁵ Heb. x. 38:

⁹⁶ See his Præfatio Parænetica, prefixed to Grabe's Septuagint.

and given a handle to the patrons of erroneous tenets, stood in need of him more as a corrector than as a translator. In this manner Beza supports the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, having been followed, in the first of these errors, by the French and English translators, but not in the second; and not by the Italian translator in either, though as much a Calvinist as any of them. In the old English Bibles, the expression was, *If he withdraw himself.*

§ 11. IN order to evade, as much as possible, the appearance of regard, in the dispensation of grace, to the disposition of the receiver, the words of the Apostle, *Τον προτερον οντα βλασφημον και διωκτην, και υβριστην αλλ' ηλεηθην, οτι αγνοων εποιησα εν απιστια*⁹⁷, he renders *Qui prius eram blasphemus et persecutor, et injuriis alios afficiens: sed misericordia sum donatus. Nam ignorans id faciebam: nempe fidei expers.* Here I observe; first, that he divides the sentence into two, making a full stop at *ηλεηθην*, and thus disjoins a clause which, in Greek, is intimately connected, and had always been so understood, as appears from all the ancient versions and commentaries: and, secondly, that he introduces this sentence with *nam*, as if, in Greek, it had been *γαρ*, instead of *quia*, the proper version of *οτι*. Both are causal conjunctions; but as the former is generally employed in uniting different sentences, and the latter in uniting the different members of

⁹⁷ 1 Tim. i. 13.

the same sentence, the union occasioned by the former is looser and more indefinite than that produced by the latter. The one expresses a connection with the general scope of what was said, the other with the particular clause immediately preceding. This second sentence, as Beza exhibits it, may be explained as an extenuation suggested by the Apostle, after confessing so black a crime. As if he had said: "For I would not have acted thus, but I knew not what I was doing, as I was then an unbeliever." It is evident that the words of the original are not susceptible of this interpretation. Beza has not been followed in this, either by Diodati, or by the English translators. The Geneva French, and the Geneva English, have both imitated his manner.

§ 12. I SHALL produce but one other instance. The words of the beloved disciple, *Πας ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἁμαρτιαν οὐ ποιεῖ*⁹⁸; rendered in the Vulgate, *Omnis qui natus est ex Deo, peccatum non facit*, Beza translates, *Quisquis natus est ex Deo, peccato non dat operam*; by this last phrase, endeavouring to elude the support which the original appears to give to the doctrine of the sinless perfection of the saints in the present life. That this was his view, is evident from what he had urged in defence of the phrase, in his annotations on the fourth verse, to which he has subjoined these words: "Itaque non homines sed monstra hominum (such was his polemic style) sunt

⁹⁸ 1 John, iii. 9.

“ Pelagiani, Cathari, Cœlestiani, Donatistæ, Anabaptistæ, Libertini, qui ex hoc loco perfectionem illam somniant, a qua absunt ipsi omnium hominum longissime.” His only argument, worthy of notice, is the seeming inconsistency of this verse, with what the Apostle had advanced a little before, *Εαν ειπωμεν ‘οτι ‘αμαρτιαν’ ουκ εχομεν, ‘εαυτους πλανωμεν*⁹⁹, *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.* But he has not considered that, if one of those human monsters (as he meekly calls them) should render this verse, *If we say that we have never sinned* (which is not a greater stretch than he has made in rendering the other,) the reconciliation of the two passages is equally well effected as by his method. But as, in fact, neither of these expedients can be vindicated, the only fair way is, to exhibit both verses in as general terms as the inspired penman has left them in; and thus to put, as nearly as possible, the readers of the translation on the same footing on which the sacred writers have put the readers of the original.

There is still another reason which seems to have influenced Beza in rendering *‘αμαρτιαν ποιει peccato dat operam*, which is kindly to favour sinners, not exorbitantly profligate, so far as to dispel all fear about their admission into the kingdom of heaven. This construction may be thought uncharitable. I own I should have thought so myself, if he had not explicitly shown his principles, on

⁹⁹ 1 John, i. 8.

this subject, in other places. That expression, in the sermon on the mount, *Αποχωρευετε απ' εμου οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν*¹⁰⁰, he renders, *Abscedite a me qui operam datis iniquitati*. And though he is singular in using this phrase, I should not, even from it, have concluded so harshly of his motive, if his explanation in the note had not put it beyond doubt. *Οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν*, “id est, OMNIBUS sceleribus et flagitiis addicti homines—qui velut artem peccandi exercent, sicut Latini medicinam, argentariam facere dicunt.” Thus, if he wound the sense in the version, he kills it outright in the commentary. In another edition, wherein he renders the text simply *facitis iniquitatem*, he says, still more expressly, “Dicuntur ergo *facere iniquitatem*, et a Christo rejiciuntur hoc in loco, non qui uno et altero scelere sunt contaminati, sed qui hanc velut artem faciunt, ut scelesto agendo vitam tolerant, et Dei nomine abutantur ad quæstum, quo cupiditatibus suis satisfaciant.” Castalio, after quoting these words, says¹⁰¹, very justly, and even moderately, “Hæc sunt ejus [Bezæ] verba, quibus mihi videtur (si modo de habitu loquitur, sicut antithesis ostendere videtur) nimis latam salutis viam facere: quasi Christus non rejiciat sceleratos, sed duntaxat sceleratissimos. Enimvero longe aliter loquuntur sacræ literæ.”

Not only Scripture in general, he might have said, but that discourse in particular, on which

¹⁰⁰ Matth. vii. 23.

¹⁰¹ Cas. Defens. Adversarii Errores.

Beza was then commenting, speaks a very different language: *Except your righteousness*, says Jesus¹⁰², *shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.* It would have better suited Beza's system of Christian morality, to have said, *Except your unrighteousness shall exceed the unrighteousness of publicans and harlots, ye shall in no case be excluded from the kingdom of heaven.* But as our Lord's declaration was the reverse, it is worth while to observe in what manner this champion of Geneva eludes its force, and reconciles it to his own licentious maxims. Hear his note upon the place: "Justitiæ nomine intellige sinceram tum
 "doctrinam tum vitam, cum verbo Dei videlicet,
 "quod est justitiæ vera norma, congruentem.
 "Sed, de doctrina potissimum hic agi liquet ex
 "sequenti reprehensione falsarum legis inter-
 "pretationum." And on the last clause of the sentence, *nequaquam ingressuros in regnum cælorum*, he says, "Id est, indignos fore qui in ecclesia doceatis. Nec enim de quorumvis piorum officio, sed de solis doctoribus agit: et nomine regni cælorum, ut alibi sæpe, non triumphan-
 "tem (ut vulgo loquuntur,) sed adhuc militan-
 "tem, et ministerio pastorum egentem ecclesiam
 "intelligit."

According to this learned commentator, then, *your righteousness* here means, chiefly or solely, *your orthodoxy*: I say, *chiefly* or *solely*: for, ob-

¹⁰² Matth. v. 20.

serve his artful climax, in speaking of teachers and teaching. When first he obtrudes the word *doctrine*, in explanation of the word *righteousness*, he puts it only on the level with a good life; it is “tum doctrinam tum vitam.” When mentioned the second time, a good life is dropt, because as he affirms, “de doctrina potissimum hic agitur.” When the subject is again resumed, in explaining the latter part of the sentence, every thing which relates to life and practice is excluded from a share in what is said; for after this gradual preparation of his readers, they are plainly told, “de solis doctoribus hic agit.” Now, every body knows, that Beza meant, by orthodoxy, or sound doctrine, an exact conformity to the Genevese standard. The import of our Lord’s declaration, then, according to this bold expositor, amounts to no more than this, ‘If ye be not completely orthodox, ye shall not be teachers in the church.’ In this way of expounding Scripture, what purposes may it not be made to serve? For my part, I have seen nothing in any commentator or casuist, which bears a stronger resemblance to that mode of subverting, under pretence of explaining, the divine law, which was adopted by the Scribes, and so severely reprehended by our Lord. In the passage taken from John’s Epistle, I do not find that Beza has had any imitators. In the version of the like phrase in the Gospel, he has been followed by the Geneva French, which says, *Vous qui faites le metier d’iniquite.*

§ 13. I MIGHT collect many more passages, but I suppose that those which have been given, will sufficiently verify what has been advanced concerning this translator's partiality. Any one who critically examines his translation, will see how much he strains in every page, especially in Paul's Epistles, to find a place for the favourite terms and phrases of his party. A French projector, Monsieur Le Cene (whose project for a new translation was, in what regards one article, considered already,) seems, though of a party in many things opposite to Beza's, to have entertained certain loose notions of translating, which in general coincide with his; but, by reason of their different parties, would have produced, in the application, contrary effects. As a contrast to Beza's corrections of the unguarded style (as he certainly thought it) of the sacred penmen, I shall give a few of Le Cene's corrections, which he proposed, with the same pious purpose of securing the unlearned reader against seduction¹⁰³. The words of the Apostle, rendered by Beza, *Qui credit in eum qui justificat impium*¹⁰⁴, Le Cene thus translates into French: *Qui croit en celui qui justifie CELUI QUI AVOIT ETE un impie*. The expression rendered by Beza, *Quem autem vult indurat*¹⁰⁵, Le Cene thinks ought to be corrected; and though he does not in so many words say how, it is plain, from the tenor of his remark, that he would have it *permittit ut seipsum induret*. He

¹⁰³ Proj. &c. ch. xiv.

¹⁰⁴ Rom. iv. 5.

¹⁰⁵ Rom. ix. 13.

adds, “ It behoveth also to reform (I use his own “ style, *Il faudroit aussi reformer*) what the Vulgate and Genevese versions (he might have added, Moses and Paul) represent God as saying to “ Pharaoh, *In hoc ipsum excitavi te, ut ostendam in “ te virtutem meam*¹⁰⁶ ;” but does not mention the reformation necessary.

I cannot help observing here by the way that, though Castalio was, in regard to the subject of the chapter from which some of the foregoing quotations are taken, of sentiments, as appears from his notes, opposite to Beza’s, and coincident with Le Cene’s, he has translated the whole with the utmost fairness. Nor has he employed any of those glossing arts recommended by Le Cene, and so much practised by Beza, when encountering a passage that appeared favourable to an adversary. Merely from his translation, we should not discover that his opinions of the divine decrees, and the freedom of human actions, differed from Beza’s. If both interpreters, however, have sometimes failed in their representations of the sacred authors, the difference between them lies in this : the liberties which Castalio has taken, are almost solely in what regards their style and manner ; the freedoms used by Beza affect their sentiments and doctrine.

But to return to Le Cene, of whom I shall give but one other specimen ; the words rendered by Beza, *Quia iterum dixit Esaias, excœcavit oculos eorum, et obduravit cor eorum ; ne videant oculis,*

¹⁰⁶ Rom. ix. 17. Exod. ix. 16.

*et sint intelligentes corde, et sese convertant, et sanem eos*¹⁰⁷; he proposes in this manner to express in French: *Ce qui avoit fait dire a Isaie; ils ont aveugles leurs yeux et endurci leur cœur, pour ne pas voir de leurs yeux, et pour n'entendre point du cœur, et de peur de se convertir, et d'etre gueris.* "They have blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart," &c. instead of, "He hath blinded," &c. Surely, the difference between these interpretations, regards more the sense than the expression. In the latter instances, we have the Arminian using the same weapons against the Calvinist, which, in the former, we saw the Calvinist employ against the Arminian; a conduct alike unjustifiable in both.

§ 14. THESE examples may suffice to show that, if translators shall think themselves entitled, with Beza and Le Cene, and the anonymous English translator above quoted, to use such liberties with the original, in order to make it speak their own sentiments, or the sentiments of the party to which they have attached themselves, we shall soon have as many Bibles as we have sects, each adapted to support a different system of doctrine and morality; a Calvinistic Bible, and an Arminian, an Antinomian Bible, a Pelagian, and I know not how many more. Hitherto, notwithstanding our disputes, we have recurred to a common standard; and this circumstance, however lightly it may be thought of, has not been without its utility, especially in countries where the Chris-

¹⁰⁷ John, xii. 39, 40.

tian principle of toleration is understood and practised. It has abated the violence of all sides, inspiring men with candour and moderation in judging of one another, and of the importance of the tenets which discriminate them. The reverse would take place, if every faction had a standard of its own, so prepared, as to be clearly decisive in supporting all its favourite dogmas, and in condemning those of every other faction. It may be said, that the original would still be a sort of common standard, whose authority would be acknowledged by them all. It no doubt would: but when we consider how small a proportion of the people, of any party, are qualified to read the original; and how much it would be the business of the leading partizans, in every sect, to pre-occupy the minds of the people, in regard to the fidelity of their own version, and the partiality of every other; we cannot imagine that the possession of a standard, to which hardly one in a thousand could have recourse, would have a sensible effect upon the party. Of so much consequence it is, in a translator, to banish all party-considerations, to forget, as far as possible, that he is connected with any party; and to be ever on his guard, lest the spirit of the sect absorb the spirit of the Christian, and he appear to be more the follower of some human teacher, a Calvin, an Arminius, a Socinus, a Pelagius, an Arius, or an Athanasius, than of our only divine and rightful teacher, Christ.

§ 15. SOME allowance is no doubt to be made for the influence of polemic theology, the epidemic

disease of those times wherein most of the versions, which I have been examining, were composed. The imaginations of men were heated, and their spirits embittered with continual wranglings, not easily avoidable in their circumstances : and those who were daily accustomed to strain every expression of the sacred writers, in their debates one with another, were surely not the fittest for examining them with that temper and coolness, which are necessary in persons who would approve themselves unbiassed translators. Besides, criticism, especially sacred criticism, was then but in its infancy. Many improvements, through the united labours of the learned in different parts of Europe, have since accrued to that science. Much of our scholastic controversy on abstruse and undeterminable questions, well characterised by the Apostle, *strifes of words, which minister not to godly edifying*¹⁰⁸, is now happily laid aside. It may be hoped, that some of the blunders into which the rage of disputation has formerly betrayed interpreters, may, with proper care, be avoided ; and that the dotage about questions, which gender contention (questions than which nothing can be more hollow or unsound¹⁰⁹,) being over, some will dare to speak, and others bear to hear, the things which become sound doctrine, the doctrine according to godliness.

¹⁰⁸ 1 Tim. vi. 3, &c.

¹⁰⁹ See an excellent sermon on this subject, by my learned colleague, Dr. Gerard, vol. II. p. 129.

50 = Feb. 19, 1853.

33

Dissertation the Eleventh.

Of the regard which, in translating Scripture into English, is due to the Practice of former Translators, particularly of the Authors of the Latin Vulgate, and of the common English Translation.

PART I.

THE REGARD DUE TO THE VULGATE.

IN the former Dissertation¹, I took occasion to consider what are the chief things to be attended to by every translator, but more especially a translator of holy writ. They appeared to be the three following; first, to give a just and clear representation of the sense of his original; secondly, to convey into his version as much of his author's spirit and manner as the genius of the language, in which he writes, will admit; thirdly, as far as may be, in a consistency with the two other ends, to express himself with purity in the language of the version. If these be the princi-

¹ X. Part I.

pal objects, as, in my opinion, they are ; they will supply us with a good rule for determining the precise degree of regard which is due to former translators of reputation, whose works may have had influence sufficient to give a currency to the terms and phrases they have adopted. When the terms and phrases employed by former interpreters are well adapted for conveying the sense of the author, when they are also suited to his manner, and do no violence to the idiom of the language of the translation, they are justly preferred to other words equally expressive and proper, but which, not having been used by former interpreters of name, are not current in that application. This, in my opinion, is the furthest we can go, without making greater account of translations than of the original, and showing more respect to the words and idioms of fallible men, than to the instructions given by the unerring Spirit of God.

§ 2. If, in respect of any of the three ends above mentioned, former translators, on the most impartial examination, appear to have failed, shall we either copy or imitate their errors ? When the question is thus put in plain terms, I do not know any critic that is hardy enough to answer in the affirmative. But we no sooner descend to particulars, than we find that those very persons who gave us reason to believe that they agree with us in the general principles, so totally differ in the application, as to show themselves disposed to

sacrifice all those primary objects in translating, to the phraseology of a favourite translator. Even Father Simon could admit that *it would be wrong to imitate the faults of Saint Jerom, and to pay greater deference to his authority than to the truth*². How far the verdicts he has pronounced on particular passages in the several versions criticised by him, are consistent with this judgment, shall be shown in the sequel.

§ 3. BUT, before I proceed farther, it may not be amiss to make some remarks on what appears to have been Simon's great scope and design in the Critical History; for, in the examination of certain points strenuously maintained by him, I shall chiefly be employed in this Dissertation. His opinions in what regards biblical criticism, have long had great influence on the judgment of the learned, both Popish and Protestant. His profound erudition in Oriental matters, joined with uncommon penetration, and, I may add, strong appearances of moderation, have procured him, on this subject, a kind of superiority, which is hardly disputed by any. Indeed, if I had not read the answers made to those who attacked his work, which are subjoined to his Critical History, and commonly, if I mistake not, thought to be his, though bearing different names, I should not have spoken so dubiously of his title to the virtue of

² En effet, il [Pagnin] auroit eu tort d'imiter les fautes de St. Jérôme, et de deferer plus à l'autorité de ce pere, qu' à la verité. Hist. Crit. du Vieux Testament, liv. ii. ch. xx.

moderation. But throughout these tracts, I acknowledge, there reigns much of the illiberal spirit of the controvertist. None of the little arts, however foreign to the subject in debate, by which contempt and odium are thrown upon an adversary, are omitted. And, we may say with truth, that by assuming too high an ascendant over Le Clerc and his other antagonists, he has degraded himself below them, farther, I believe, than, by any other method, he could have so easily effected.

§ 4. IN regard to Simon's principal work, which I have so often had occasion to mention, *the Critical History of the Old and New Testaments*, its merit is so well known and established in the learned world, as to render it superfluous now to attempt its character. I shall only animadvert a little on what appear to me, after repeated perusals, to be the chief objects of the author, and on his manner of pursuing these objects. It will scarcely admit a doubt, that his primary scope, throughout the whole performance, is to represent Scripture as, in every thing of moment, either unintelligible or ambiguous. His view in this is sufficiently glaring; it is to convince his readers that, without the aid of tradition, whereof the church is both the depositary and the interpreter, no one article of Christianity can, with evidence sufficient to satisfy a rational inquirer, be deduced from Scripture. A second aim, but in subordination to the former, is to bring his readers to such an acquiescence in the Latin Vulgate, which he

calls the translation of the church, as to consider the deviations from it in modern versions, from whatever cause they spring, attention to the meaning, or to the letter, of the original, as erroneous and indefensible.

The manner in which the first of these aims has been pursued by him, I took occasion to consider in a former Dissertation³, to which I must refer my reader; I intend now to inquire a little into the methods by which he supports this secondary aim, the faithfulness of the Vulgate, and, if not its absolute perfection, its superiority, at least to every other attempt that has been made, in the Western churches, towards translating the Bible. This inquiry naturally falls in with the first part of my subject in the present Dissertation, in which I hope to show, to the satisfaction of the reader, that he might, with equal plausibility, have maintained the superiority of that version over every translation which ever shall, or can, be made of holy writ.

§ 5. FROM the view which I have given of his design with respect to the Vulgate, one would naturally expect, that he must rate very highly the verdict of the council of Trent, in favour of that version, that he must derive its excellence, as others of his order have done, from immediate inspiration, and conclude it to be infallible. Had this been his method of proceeding, his book

³ Diss. III. § 1—17.

would have excited little attention from the beginning, except from those whose minds were pre-engaged on the same side by bigotry or interest, and would probably, long ere now, have been forgotten. What person of common sense in these days ever thinks of the ravings of Harduin the Jesuit, who, in opposition to antiquity and all the world, maintained, that the Apostles and Evangelists wrote in Latin, that the Vulgate was the original, and the Greek New Testament a version, and that consequently the latter ought to be corrected by the former, not the former by the latter, with many other absurdities⁴, to which Michaelis has done too much honour, in attempting to refute them in his lectures?

But Simon's method was, in fact, the reverse. The sentence of the council, as was hinted formerly, he has explained in such a manner as to denote no more than would be readily admitted by every

⁴ Such as, that, except Cicero's works, Pliny's Natural History, the Georgics, Horace's Epistles, and a few others, all the ancient classics Greek and Latin are the forgeries of monks in the 13th century. Virgil's Eneid is not excepted. This, according to him, was a fable invented for exhibiting the triumph of the church over the synagogue. Troy was Jerusalem, in a similar manner, reduced to ashes after a siege. Eneas carrying his gods into Italy, represented St. Peter travelling to Rome to preach the gospel to the Romans, and there lay the foundations of the hierarchy. I heartily join in Boileau's sentiment, (for of him it is told, if I remember right) "I should like much to have conversed with friar Virgil, and friar Livy, and friar Horace; for we see no such friars now."

moderate and judicious Protestant. The inspiration of the translator he disclaims, and consequently the infallibility of the version. He ascribes no superiority to it above the original. This superiority was but too plainly implied in the indecent comparison which Cardinal Ximenes made of the Vulgate as printed in his edition (the Complutensian) between the Hebrew and the Septuagint, to our Lord crucified between two thieves, making the Hebrew represent the hardened thief, and the Greek the penitent. Simon, on the contrary, shows no disposition to detract from the merit either of the original, or of any ancient version; though not inclinable to allow more to the editions and transcripts we are at present possessed of, than the principles of sound criticism appear to warrant. He admits that we have yet no perfect version of holy writ, and does not deny that a better may be made than any extant⁵. In short, nothing can be more equitable than the general maxims he establishes. It is by this method that he insensibly gains upon his readers, insinuates himself into their good graces, and brings them, before they are aware, to repose an implicit confidence in his discernment, and to admit, without examining, the equity of his particular decisions. Now all these decisions are made artfully to conduct them to one point, which he is the surer to carry, as he never openly proposes it, namely, to consider the Vulgate as the standard, by a conformity to which, the value of every other version ought to be estimated.

⁵ Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. III. ch. i.

§ 6. IN consequence of this settled purpose, not declared in words, but, without difficulty, discovered by an attentive reader, he finds every other version which he examines, either too literal or too loose, in rendering almost every passage which he specifies, according as it is more or less so, than that which he has tacitly made to serve as the common measure for them all. And though it is manifest, that even the most literal are not more blameably literal in any place than the Vulgate is in other places; or even the most loose translations more wide of the sense than in some instances that version may be shown to be; he has always the address, to bring his readers (at least on their first reading his book) to believe with him, that the excess, of whatever kind it be, is in the other versions, and not in the Vulgate. In order to this he is often obliged to argue from contrary topics, and at one time to defend a mode of interpreting which he condemns at another. And though this inevitably involves him in contradictions, these, on a single, or even a second or third perusal, are apt to be overlooked by a reader who is not uncommonly attentive. The inconsistencies elude the reader's notice the more readily, as they are not brought under his view at once, but must be gathered from parts of the work not immediately connexed; and, as the individual passages in question are always different, though the manner in which they are translated, and on which the criticism turns, is the same. Add to this, that our critic's mode of arguing is the more

specious and unsuspected, because it is remarkably simple and dispassionate. It will be necessary, therefore, though it may be accounted a bold and even invidious undertaking, to re-examine a few of the passages examined by Father Simon, that we may, if possible, discover whether there be reason for the charge of partiality and inconsistency, which has been just now brought against him.

§ 7. IN his examination of Erasmus's version of the New Testament, he has the following observation : " Where we have in the Greek *τον ὀρισθεντος υἱου Θεου εν δυναμει*⁶, the ancient Latin interpreter has very well and literally rendered it, *qui prædestinatus est filius Dei in virtute*, which was also the version used in the Western churches before Saint Jerom, who has made no change on this place. I do not inquire whether that interpreter has read *προορισθεντος* as some believe : for *prædestinatus* signifies no more here than *destinatus* : and one might put in the translation *prædestinatus*, who read *ὀρισθεντος*, as we read at present in all the Greek copies ; and there is nothing here that concerns what theologians commonly call *predestination*. Erasmus, however, has forsaken the ancient version, and said, *qui declaratus fuit filius Dei cum potentia*. It is true, that many learned Greek fathers have explained the Greek participle *ὀρισθεντος* by *δειχθεντος, αποφάνθεντος* ; that is,

⁶ Rom. i. 4.

“ *demonstrated* or *declared* ; but an explanation is
 “ not a translation. One may remark, in a note,
 “ that that is the sense which Saint Chrysostom
 “ has given the passage, without changing the
 “ ancient version, as it very well expresses the
 “ energy of the Greek word, which signifies
 “ rather *destinatus* and *definitus* than *declaratus* ⁷.”
 Thus far Simon.

Admit that the Vulgate is here literal, since this critic is pleased to call it so ; it is at the same time obscure, if not unmeaning. What the import

⁷ Où il y a dans le Grec, του ὀρισθέντος υἱου Θεου εν δυναμει, l'ancien interprete Latin a fort bien traduit à la lettre, qui *prædestinatus est filius Dei in virtute* ; et c'est même la version qui étoit en usage dans les eglises d'Occident avant Saint Jerome, qui n'y a rien changé en cet endroit. Je n'examine point si cet interprete a lu προορισθέντος, comme quelques uns le croyent : car *prædestinatus* ne signifie en ce lieu-là que *destinatus* ; et ainsi l'on a pû traduire *prædestinatus* en lisant ὀρισθέντος, comme on lit presentement dans tous les exemplaires Grecs, et il ne s'agit nullement de ce que les theologiens appellent ordinairement *predestination*. Erasme cependant s'est éloigné de cette ancienne version, ayant traduit qui *declaratus fuit filius Dei cum potentia*. Il est vrai que plusieurs doctes peres Grecs ont expliqué le verbe Grec ὀρισθέντος par δειχθέντος, αποφανθέντος c'est-à-dire démontré ou déclaré : mais une explication n'est pas une traduction. L'on peut marquer dans une note que c'est là le sens que Saint Chrysostome a donné à ce passage, sans changer pour cela la version ancienne, qui exprime trèsbien la force du mot Grec qui signifie plutôt *destinatus*, *definitus* que *declaratus*. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

of the word *predestinated* may be when, as he says, it has no relation to what divines call *predestination*, and consequently cannot be synonymous with *predetermined*, *foreordained*, he has not been so kind as to tell us, and it will not be in every body's power to guess. For my part, I do not comprehend that curious aphorism as here applied, *An explanation is not a translation*. Translation is undoubtedly one species, and that both the simplest and the most important species, of explanation: and when a word is found in one language, which exactly hits the sense of a word in another language as used in a particular passage, though it should not reach the meaning in other places, it is certainly both the proper translation, and the best explanation, of the word in that passage.

And, for the truth of this sentiment, I am happy to have it in my power to add, that I have the concurrence of Mr. Simon himself most explicitly declared. Speaking of a Spanish translation of the Old Testament by a Portuguese Jew, which is very literal, as all Jewish translations are, he says⁸, "This grammatical rigour does not often suit the sense. We must distinguish between a

⁸ Cette rigueur de grammaire ne s'accorde pas souvent avec le sens. Il faut mettre de la difference entre un dictionnaire et une traduction. Dans le premier on explique les mots selon leur signification propre, au-lieu que dans l'autre il est quelquefois necessaire de detourner les mots de leur significations propres et primitives, pour les ajuster aux autres mots avec lesquels ils sont joints. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xix.

“ dictionary and a translation. In the former, one
 “ explains the words according to their proper
 “ signification, whereas, in the latter, it is some-
 “ times necessary to divert them from their prop-
 “ er and primitive signification, in order to adjust
 “ them to the other words with which they are
 “ connected.” In another place⁹, “ He (*Pagnin*)
 “ has imagined that, in order to make a faithful
 “ translation of Scripture, it was necessary to fol-
 “ low the letter exactly, and according to the rigour
 “ of grammar ; a practice quite opposite to that
 “ pretended exactness, because it rarely happens
 “ that two languages agree in their idioms ; and
 “ thus, so far from expressing his original in the
 “ same purity wherein it is written, he disfigures
 “ it, and spoils it of all its ornaments.” In the
 former of these quotations, the author shows that
 the literal method is totally unfit for conveying an
 author’s sense, and therefore ill suited for an-
 swering the first great end in translating ; and in
 the latter, that it is no better adapted either for
 doing justice to an author’s manner, or for pro-
 ducing a work which can be useful or agreeable,
 and therefore equally unfit for all the primary

⁹ Il s’est imaginé que pour faire une traduction fidelle de l’Ecriture, il étoit nécessaire de suivre la lettre exactment et selon la rigueur de la grammaire ; ce qui est tout-à-fait opposé à cette prétendue exactitude, parce qu’il est rare que deux langues se rencontrent dans leurs façons de parler : et ainsi, bien loin d’exprimer son original dans la même pureté qu’il est écrit, il le défigure, et le depouille de tous ses ornemens. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

purposes of translating. Had it been this author's declared intention to refute his own criticism on the passage quoted from Erasmus, he could have said nothing stronger or more pertinent.

I shall just add to his manner of reasoning on this subject, a particular example, which may serve as a counterpart to the remark on Erasmus above quoted. Speaking of the translators of Port Royal, he says¹⁰, "They have followed the grammatical sense of the Greek text in translating John, xvi. 13. *Il vous fera entrer dans toutes les verites*, as if this other sense, which is in the Vulgate, and which they have put into their note, *il vous enseignera toute verite*, did not answer exactly to the Greek. But John Boys has not thought the new translators worthy of approbation for changing *docebit*, which is in our Latin edition, into another word. *Vetus*, says this learned Protestant, *docebit, non male, nam et ὁ διδασκων suo modo ὀδηγει, et ὁ ὀδηγων suo modo διδασκει.*" Yet let it be observed, that here it is the new interpreters, and not the Vulgate, who very well express the energy of the Greek word, and that without either deserting the meaning or darkening it, as the Vulgate, in the former case,

¹⁰ Ils ont suivi le sens grammatical du texte Grec en traduisant, *il vous fera entrer*, &c. comme si cet autre sens qui est dans la Vulgate, et qu'ils ont mit dans leur note, *il vous enseignera*, &c. ne repondoit pas exactement au Grec. Mais Jean Boys n'a pû approuver les nouveaux traducteurs, qui ont changé *docebit*, qui est dans nôtre edition Latine en un autre mot. *Vetus*, &c. Hist. Crit. de Versions du N. T. ch. xxxvi.

has not scrupled to do. Here he has given, indeed, the most ample scope for retorting upon the Vulgate, in his own words, that *ὁδηγεῖ* may indeed be explained by *docebit*, “but an explanation is “not a translation.”

§ 8. But this is not all. Our critic objects also to the freedom which Erasmus has taken in translating the Greek preposition *ἐν* in the forecited passage by the Latin *cum*. “Besides,” says he¹¹, “although the Greek particle *ἐν* signifies, in the “style of the writers of the New Testament, “which is conformable to that of the Seventy, *in* “and *cum*, it had been better to translate, as it is “in the Vulgate, *in virtute*, or *in potentia*, and to “write on the margin that *in* signifies also *cum*, “because there is but one single preposition “which answers to them both in the Hebrew or “Chaldaic language, with which the Greek of the “New Testament often agrees, especially in this “sort of prepositions.”

Now it is very remarkable, that there is nothing which he treats as more contemptible and even absurd in Arias Montanus, than this very attempt at

¹¹ De plus, bien que la particule Grecque *ἐν* signifie dans le stile des ecrivains du Nouveau Testament qui est conforme à celui des Septante, *in* et *cum*, il eût été mieux de traduire, comme il y a dans la Vulgate *in virtute* ou *in potentia*, et de mettre à la marge que *in* signifie aussi *cum* ; parce qu’il n’y a qu’une seule preposition qui réponde à ces deux-la dans la langue Ebraïque ou Caldaïque, a laquelle le Grec du N. T. est souvent conforme, sur-tout dans ces sortes de prepositions. N. T. l. II. c. xxii.

uniformity, in translating the Hebrew prepositions and other particles. “Can one,” says he¹², “give the title of a very exact interpreter, to a translator, who almost every where confounds the sense of his text? In effect, all his erudition consists in translating the Hebrew words literally, according to their most ordinary signification, without minding whether it agree, or not, with the context where he employs it. When the Hebrew words are equivocal, one ought, methinks, to have some regard to that signification which suits them in the places where they are found; and it is ridiculous to assign them in-

¹² Peut on donner la qualité d'interprete très-exact à un traducteur qui renverse presque partout le sens de son texte? En effet, toute son erudition consiste à traduire les mots Hebreux à la lettre, selon leur signification la plus ordinaire, sans prendre garde si elle convient ou non, aux endroits où il l'emyloy. Quand les mots Hebreux sont equivoques, on doit, ce semble, avoir egard a la signification qui leur est propre selon les lieux où ils se trouvent, et il est ridicule de mettre indifferement toute sorte de signification, soit qu'elle convienne, ou qu'elle ne convienne pas. Ce defaut est cependant repandu dans toute la version d' Arias Montanus, qui a fait paroître en cela très-peu de jugement. Il a traduit, par exemple, presque en tous les endroits la preposition Ebraïque *al* par la preposition Latine *super* : et cependant on sait, que cette preposition signifie dans l'Ebreu tantôt *super*, tantôt *juxta*, et quelquefois *cum*. Il a fait la même chose à l'égard de la lettre *Lamed*, laquelle repond au *pour* des François, ou elle est une marque du datif. C'est ainsi qu'au chapitre premier de la Genese, verset sixieme, où Pagnin avoit traduit assez nettement *Dividat aquas ab aquis*, il a traduit sans aucun sens *Dividat aquas ad aquas*. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

“ differently every sort of signification suitable or
 “ unsuitable. Yet this fault abounds in every
 “ part of the version of Arias Montanus, who has
 “ herein displayed very little judgment. He has,
 “ for example, translated, in almost every passage,
 “ the Hebrew preposition *al* by the Latin *super* ;
 “ whereas it is well known that this preposition
 “ signifies in Hebrew, sometimes *super*, some-
 “ times *juxta*, sometimes *cum*. He has done the
 “ same in regard to the letter *Lamed*, which an-
 “ swers to the French *pour*, where it is a mark of
 “ the dative. Thus the words of Genesis, which
 “ Pagnin had rendered clearly enough *Dividat*
 “ *aquas ab aquis*, he has translated, without any
 “ meaning, *Dividat aquas ad aquas.*”

Here in two parallel cases, for the question is the same in both, whether the sense or the letter merit most the attention of the translator, or more particularly, whether or not the prepositions of the original ought uniformly to be translated in the same way, without regard to the sense, our learned critic has pronounced two sentences perfectly opposite to each other. This opposition is the more flagrant, as Arias had actually taken the method which Simon insists that Erasmus ought to have taken. He followed the letter in the text, and gave the meaning, by way of comment, on the margin. The second decision, however, we may reasonably conclude, is the decision of his judgment, as neither of the interpreters compared, Pagnin nor Arias, is a favourite with

him; whereas the first is the decision merely of his affection, as Erasmus was opposed to the Vulgate.

§ 9. IN further confirmation of the judgment I have just now given, it may be observed that in every case wherein the Vulgate is not concerned, his verdict is uniform in preferring the sense to the letter. “There is,” says he¹³, “in this last “revisal of the version of Geneva, *Alors on commença d'appeller du nom de l'Eternel*, which “yields an obscure and even absurd meaning. “It is indeed true that Aquila has translated “word for word after the same manner; but he “has followed literally the grammatical sense. “Now, with the aid of a very slight acquaintance “with Hebrew, one might know that this phrase “*appeller du nom* signifies to invoke the name, “especially when the discourse is of God.” In like manner, when the Vulgate is concerned in the question, and happens to follow the sense in an instance wherein the version compared with it prefers the letter, we may be certain that our author's decision is then for the sense. “The

¹³ Il y a dans cette dernière révision [de la version de Genève] *Allors on commença d'appeller du nom de l'Eternel*. Ce qui fait un sens obscur, et même impertinent. Il est bien vrai qu' Aquila a traduit mot pour mot de la même manière : mais il a suivi à la lettre le sens grammatical, et pour peu qu'on ait lû d'Ebrenu, on sait que cette façon de parler *appeller du nom* signifie *invoker le nom* de quelqu'un, principalement quand il est parlé de Dieu. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xxiv.

“Seventy,” he tells us ¹⁴, “have rendered *Επικατα-
 ρατος ου απο παντων των κτηνων*, where we have
 “in the Vulgate, *maledictus es inter omnia ani-
 mantia* : the Greek word *απο*, used by the Sep-
 tuagint in this place, is unsuitable and nonsen-
 sical.” Such is the sentence which our author
 invariably pronounces on this truly senseless mode
 of translating.

But still it is with a secret exception of all the
 instances wherein this senseless mode of translat-
 ing has been adopted by the Vulgate. For this
 adoption has instantly converted it into the only
 proper method, and the version which the plain
 sense of the passage indicates, must then be con-
 signed to the margin ; for *an explanation is not a
 translation*.

§ 10. To the preceding remarks, I shall sub-
 join two more of Father Simon on the version of
 Erasmus, in which he cannot indeed accuse that
 learned interpreter of departing further either
 from the letter, or from the sense, than the Vul-
 gate itself, but merely of leaving the Vulgate,
 and rendering the Greek word differently. Simon
 has in this cause a powerful ally, John Bois,
 canon of Ely, a man whom, not without reason,
 he extols for his learning and critical sagacity ;

¹⁴ Les Septante ont traduit *Επικαταρατος ου απο παντων
 των κτηνων*, où il y a dans la Vulgate, *Maledictus es inter om-
 nia animantia* : le mot Grec *απο*, dont les Septante se sont
 servis en cet endroit n’y convient point, et ne fait aucun sens.
 Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. v.

and one who had, besides, such an attachment to the Vulgate as exactly tallied with his own. For Bois, in every instance wherein the Vulgate is literal, finds a freer method loose, profane, and intolerable : and when the Vulgate follows more the sense than the letter, which is not unfrequently the case, no person can be more decisive than he, that the literal method is servile, barbarous, unmeaning, and such as befits only a school-boy.

But to return to Simon : “ Erasmus,” says he ¹⁵, “ rendered not very appositely *obscurant* what in “ the Vulgate was *exterminant*, and in the Greek “ *αφανιζουσι*. John Bois, who has defended in “ this place the Latin interpreter, by the au- “ thority of Saint Chrysostom, who explains the “ verb *αφανιζουσι* by *διαφθειρουσι*, *they corrupt*, “ maintains that we ought to give this meaning to “ the Latin verb *exterminant*. He condemns the “ new interpreters who have translated otherwise, “ under pretence that this word is not good Latin. “ *Parum fortasse eleganter,*” says he, “ *verbum* “ *αφανιζουσι sic reddidit, sed apposite ut qui max-*

¹⁵ Il n'étoit pas à propos qu'Erasmus traduisit *obscurant*, où il y a dans la Vulgate *exterminant*, et dans le Grec *αφανιζουσι* (Mat. vi. 16.) Jean Bois qui a defendu en cet endroit l'interprete Latin par l'autorité de Saint Chrysostome, lequel explique le verbe *αφανιζουσι* par *διαφθειρουσι*, *corrompent*, pretend qu'on doit donner ce sens au verbe Latin *exterminant*. Il condamne les nouveaux interpretes qui ont traduit autrement sous pre-texte que ce mot n'est pas assez Latin. Si cette expression, dit-il, n'a rien d'elegant, au moins elle est très-propre. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

“*ime.*” But how is the authority of Chrysostom concerned in the question? Chrysostom, indeed, affirms that *αφανιζουσι* is in this place equivalent to *διαφθειρουσι*, but says nothing at all of *exterminant*, the only word about which we are in doubt.

For my part, I believe I shall not be singular in thinking, that it is far from being apposite in the present application. “John Bois,” he says, “maintains that we ought to give the same meaning with *διαφθειρουσι* to the Latin verb.” But is it in the power of John Bois, or of Richard Simon, or of both, to give what sense they please to a Latin verb? On this hypothesis, indeed, they may translate in any way, and defend any translation which they choose to patronize. But if, in Latin, as in all other languages, propriety must be determined by use, the word *exterminant* is in this place, I say not inelegant, but improper. It is not chargeable with inelegance, because used by good writers, but is charged with impropriety, because unauthorized in this acceptance. And even, if it should not be quite unexampled, it must be admitted to be obscure and indefinite, on account of the uncommonness of the application.

§ 11. THE other example follows¹⁶: “Erasmus’ desertion of the ancient edition has often arisen

¹⁶ Cet éloignement vient souvent de ce qu’il [Erasmus] a crû que l’ancienne édition n’est pas assez Latine. Par exemple

“ from the belief that the Latin was not pure
 “ enough. For example, instead of saying *noluit*
 “ *consolari*, he has said *noluit consolationem admit-*
 “ *tere*. Yet *consolari* occurs in the passive in
 “ some ancient authors. Besides, this great ex-
 “ actness about the propriety of the Latin words
 “ in a version of the Scriptures is not always sea-
 “ sonable. The interpreter’s principal care should
 “ be to express well the sense of the original.”
 True. But to express the sense well, and to
 give it in proper words, are, in my apprehension,
 very nearly, if not entirely, coincident. I admit,
 indeed (if that be the author’s meaning,) that it
 would not be seasonable to recur to circumlocu-
 tion, or to affected and far-fetched expressions,
 and avoid such as are simple and perspicuous, be-
 cause not used by the most elegant writers. But
 this is not the case here. The expression which
 Erasmus has adopted, is sufficiently plain and
 simple ; and, though *consolari* may sometimes be
 found in a passive signification, there can be no
 doubt that the active meaning is far the more
 common. Now, to avoid even the slightest am-
 biguity in the version, where there is nothing

(dans Mat. ii. 18.) au lieu de *noluit consolari*, il a mis *noluit consolationem admittere*. On trouve cependant *consolari* au passif, dans d’anciens auteurs ; outre que cette grande exactitude pour la propriété des mots Latins, dans une version de l’Ecriture, n’est pas toujours de saison. L’on doit principalement prendre garde à bien exprimer le sens de l’original. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

ambiguous in the original, would be a sufficient reason with any man but an Arias or an Aquila, for a greater deviation from the form of the expression, than this can reasonably be accounted.

§ 12. THIS critical historian is indeed so sensible of the futility of the greater part of his remarks on the version of Erasmus, that he, in a manner, apologizes for it. "This sort of alterations," says he¹⁷, "so frequent in Erasmus's version, is generally of no importance; but it would have been more judicious to alter nothing in the ancient interpreter of the church, but what it was absolutely necessary to correct, in order to render him more exact: and perhaps it would have been better to put the corrections in the margin in form of remarks." This is a topic to which he is perpetually recurring. It was not unsuitable for one who thought as Father Simon seems sometimes to have done, to use this plea as an argument against making new translations of the Bible into Latin: but it is not at all pertinent to obtrude it upon the readers (as he often does,) in the examination of the versions actually made. The question, in regard to these,

¹⁷ Ces sortes de changemens qui sont frequents dans la version d'Erasmus, sont la plupart de nulle importance; mais il étoit plus judicieux de ne changer dans l'ancien interprete de l'église, que ce qu'il étoit absolument necessaire de corriger, pour le rendre plus exact: et peut-etre même étoit il mieux de mettre les corrections à la marge, en forme de remarque. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

is, or ought to be, solely concerning the justness of the version. Nor is it easy to conceive another motive for confounding topics so different, but to excite such prejudices in the readers, as may preclude a candid examination.

As to his critique upon the translation made by Erasmus, it appears to me, I own, exceedingly trifling. I believe every impartial reader will be disposed to conclude as much from the examples above produced. And I cannot help adding, in regard to the whole of his criticisms on that version, with the exception of a very few, that they are either injudicious, the changes made by the interpreter being for the better; or frivolous, the changes being, at least, not for the worse. I admit a few exceptions. Thus, the *cui servio* of the Vulgate, is preferable to the *quem colo* of Erasmus, as a version of $\acute{\omega}$ λατρευω¹⁸, and better suited to the scope of the passage. *Λειτουργουτων δε αυτων*¹⁹, could not have been more justly rendered than by the Vulgate, *ministrantibus autem illis*. The expression adopted by Erasmus, *Cum autem illi sacrificarent*, is like one of Beza's stretches, though on a different side. Simon's censure of this passage deserves to be recorded as an evidence of his impartiality, in his theological capacity at least, however much we may think him sometimes biassed as a critic. "Erasmus," says he²⁰, "has limited to the sacrifice,

¹⁸ Rom. i. 9.

¹⁹ Acts, xiii. 2.

²⁰ Il a limité au sacrifice ou à l'action publique que les Grecs appellent *liturgie*, et les Latins *messe*, ce qu'on doit entendre

“ or the public action which the Greeks call *liturgy*, and the Latins *mass*, that which, in this place, ought to be understood of the ministry and functions in general, of the first ministers of the church. He had, therefore, no reason to reform the version of the ancient interpreter, who expresses, agreeably both to the letter and to the sense, the Greek verb *λειτουργειν*.”

Among the Romish translators into modern languages, Erasmus, in this particular, soon had his imitators. *Corbin*, in his French version, rendered that passage, *Eux celebrans le saint sacrifice de la messe*. After him, Father *Veron*, *Les Apotres celebrent la messe au Seigneur*. “ The reason,” says Simon²¹, “ which Veron offers for translating it in this manner, is because the Calvinists had often asked him in what passage of Scripture it was mentioned that the Apostles ever said mass.” This plea of Veron is not unlike the mode of reasoning in his own defence, of which I had occasion formerly

en ce lieu-là generalement du ministere et des fonctions des premiers ministres de l'église. Il n'a donc pas eu raison de reformer la version de l'ancien interprete qui exprime très-bien à la lettre, et selon le sens, le verbe Grec *λειτουργειν*. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxiii.

²¹ La raison qu'il apporte de sa traduction en cet endroit, est que les Calvinistes lui avoient souvent demandé en quel lieu de l'Écriture il étoit marqué que les apôtres eussent dit la messe. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxi.

to produce some examples from Beza²². That father, that he might not again be at a loss for an answer to such troublesome querists as he had found in those disciples of Calvin, was resolved that, whether the mass had a place in the original or not, or even in the Vulgate, it should stand forth conspicuous in his translation, so that no person could mistake it. The reader will not be surprised to learn, that he was a controvertist by profession, as appears from his addition in the title of his book, “*Dòcteur en Theologie, Predicateur et Lecteur du Roi pour les Controverses, Depute par Nosseigneurs du Clerge, pour ecrire sur icelles.*” And to show of what consequence he thought these particulars were to qualify him as a translator, he observes in the preface²³, that “the quality of holy writ well deserves, on several important accounts, that its translators should be doctors in theology, and especially well versed in controversies.” Simon’s observation on this sentiment, merits our utmost attention: “It is true,” says he²⁴, “that it were to be wished that those who meddle with translating the Bible, were learned in theology; but it should be another sort of theology than the controver-

²² Diss. X. Part V. § 5, 6. 9.

²³ La qualité de l’Ecriture sainte mérite bien aussi pour divers chefs que ses traducteurs soient docteurs en theologie, et bien verséz specialement aux controverses. Ibid.

²⁴ Il est vrai qu’il seroit à desirer que ceux qui se mêlent de traduire la bible fussent sçavans dans la theologie : mais ce

“ sial ; for it frequently happens, that controvertists
 “ discover in the Bible things not in it, and that
 “ they limit the significations of the words by
 “ their own ideas.”

§ 13. BUT, to return to the detection I have attempted of Simon's partiality as a critic, and of the contradictory arguments in which he is often involved by it ; we should think him sometimes as much attached to the letter, and even to the arrangement of the words in the original, as any devotee of the synagogue ; and at other times disposed to allow great freedoms in both respects. When we examine into the reason of this inconsistency, we always find that the former is a prelude to the defence of the Vulgate in general, or of some obscure and barbarous expression in that version : the latter is often, but not always, in vindication of something in the Vulgate, expressed more freely than perhaps was expedient, or, at least, necessary ; for there are great inequalities in that translation. I say, in this case, *often*, but not *always* ; because, as was hinted before, when there is no scope for party-attachment, his own good sense determines him to prefer those who keep close to the meaning, before those who keep close to the letter.

doit être une autre theologie que celle qui regarde la controverse ; car il arrive souvent que les controversistes voyent dans la bible des choses qui n'y sont point, et qu'ils en limitent quelquefois les mots selon leurs idées. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxi.

“ It flows,” says he ²⁵, “ from want of respect for the writings of the Apostles, to transpose the order of their words, under pretence that this transposition forms a clearer and more natural sense. This may properly be remarked, but it is not allowable to make such a change in the text.” Again ²⁶: “ People of sense will prefer the barbarism of the ancient Latin edition to the politeness of Erasmus, because it is no fault, in an interpreter of Scripture, to follow closely his original, and to exhibit even its transpositions of words. If the interpreter of the church does not employ Latin terms sufficiently pure, it is because he is determined to render faithfully the words of his original. It is easy to remedy, by short notes, such pretended faults.”

The preceding observations and reasoning he has himself answered in another place, in a way

²⁵ Ce n'est pas aussi avoir assez de respect pour les écrits des apôtres, que de transposer l'ordre des mots sous prétexte que cette transposition forme un sens plus net et plus naturel. Il est bon de le remarquer ; mais il n'est pas permis de faire ce changement dans le texte. *Hist. Crit. des. Com^{tes} du N. T.* ch. lx.

²⁶ Les gens de bon sens préféreront la barbarie de l'ancienne édition Latine à la politesse d'Erasmus, parceque ce n'est pas un défaut dans un interprète de l'Écriture de suivre fidèlement son original, et d'en représenter jusqu'aux hyperbates. Si l'interprète de l'église ne s'explique pas en des termes Latins assez purs, c'est qu'il s'est attaché à rendre fidèlement les mots de son original. Il est aisé de remédier à ces prétendus défauts par des petites notes.

that is quite satisfactory. “A translator of Scripture,” says he²⁷, “ought to take care not to attach himself entirely to the order of the words in the original; otherwise, it will be impossible for him to avoid falling into ambiguities; because the languages do not accord with each other in every thing.” Again²⁸: “A translator ought not simply to count the words; but he ought, besides, to examine in what manner they may be joined together, so as to form a good meaning; otherwise his translation will be puerile and ridiculous.” In another place he is still more indulgent²⁹: “One ought, doubtless, to consider the difference of the languages: our manners and our expressions do not suit those

²⁷ Un traducteur de l'Écriture doit prendre garde à ne s'attacher pas entièrement à l'ordre des mots qui est dans l'original; autrement il sera impossible qu'il ne tombe dans des équivoques, parce que les langues ne se rapportent pas en tout les unes aux autres. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. III. ch. ii.

²⁸ Un traducteur ne doit pas compter simplement les mots; mais il doit de plus examiner, de quelle manière on les peut joindre ensemble pour former un bon sens; autrement sa traduction sera puerile et ridicule. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

²⁹ On doit à la vérité considérer la différence de langues, nos manières et nos expressions ne s'accordant point avec celles des anciens peuples d'Orient. Sur ce pied-là je conviens, avec le P. Amelote, qu'il n'a pas été nécessaire qu'il employât la conjonction *et* dans tous les endroits où elle se trouve dans le Nouveau Testament, parce que cette répétition nous choque, aussi bien que ces autres particules, *voilà, donc, or, parce que*. Je suis même persuadé qu'il en a pu substituer d'autres en leur place. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxiii.

“ of the ancient Orientals. For this reason, I
 “ agree with Father Amelote, that it was not ne-
 “ cessary that he should employ the conjunction
 “ *and* in all the places where it is found in the
 “ New Testament, because this repetition shocks
 “ us ; as do also these other particles, *behold*,
 “ *now, then, because*. I am convinced that Ame-
 “ lote did right in substituting others in their
 “ stead.”

If it should be asked, Why does not Simon en-join rather, in those places, to trace the letter, at all hazards, in the text, and recur to the margin, his never-failing resource on other occasions, for what regards the meaning? I know no pertinent answer that can be given, unless that, in the places just now quoted, he is not engaged in defending the obscurities, and even the nonsense, of the Vulgate, against the plain sense of other versions.

§ 14. To those above cited, I shall add but a few other specimens. “ It is,” says he ³⁰, “ much
 “ more proper, in a translation of the sacred books
 “ into the vulgar tongue, to attach one’s self, as
 “ much as possible, to the letter, than to give
 “ meanings too free in quitting it.” Again ³¹:

³⁰ Il est bien plus à propos dans une traduction des livres sacrés en langue vulgaire, de s’attacher à la lettre autant qu’il est possible, que de donner des sens trop libres en la quittant. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

³¹ On doit avoir ce respect pour les livres sacrés qui ne peuvent être traduits trop à la lettre, pourveu qu’on se fasse entendre. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

“ This respect is due to the sacred books, which cannot be too literally interpreted, provided they be made intelligible.” This sentiment appears moderate, on a general view ; yet, when applied to particular cases, it will not be found to be that author’s sentiment. And, what may be thought more extraordinary, this rule of his will be found to require, when judged by his own criticisms, both too much, and too little.

First, it requires too much ; because it implies that we are never to forsake the letter, unless when, by adhering to it, the expression might be rendered unintelligible. Yet, in a quotation lately given from that author, he admits, that the particles *and, behold, now, then, because*, may be either omitted or changed, and that not on account of their hurting the sense, which they rarely do, but expressly, because the frequent recurrence of such words shocks us, that is, offends, our ears. An additional evidence of the same thing is, the exception he takes to Munster’s translation, which he declares to be too literal, and consequently rude, though, at the same time, he acknowledges it to be sufficiently intelligible³². The sacred books, then, may be too literally interpreted, though they be made intelligible. Assertions more manifestly contradictory it is impossible to conceive.

³² Quoique sa version soit assez intelligible, elle a néanmoins quelque chose de rude, parce qu’elle suit trop la lettre du texte Ebreu. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xxi.

Secondly, the rule he has given us requires too little ; because it evidently implies that the letter ought to be deserted, when to do so is necessary for expressing the sense perspicuously. Now, if that had been uniformly our critic's opinion, we should never have had so many recommendations of the margin for correcting the ambiguities, false meanings, and no meanings, which a rigorous adherence to the letter had brought into the text of the Vulgate, and which he will not permit to be changed in other versions.

§ 15. I HAVE already given it as my opinion, that Father Simon's sentiments on this subject, when unbiassed by any special purpose, were rational and liberal. I have given some evidences of this, and intend here to add a few more. Speaking of the Greek version of the Old Testament, by Aquila the Jew, he says³³, " One cannot excuse this interpreter's vicious affectation (which St. Jerom has named *κακοζηλια*, or *ridiculous zeal*,) in translating every word of his text entirely by the letter, and in so rigid a manner, as to render his version altogether barbarous." Again³⁴ : " The Seventy, who translate the

³³ On ne peut pas excuser cet interprete d'une affectation vicieuse (que St. Jerome a nommé *κακοζηλιαν*, ou *zele ridicule*) d'autant qu'il a traduit chaque mot de son texte entierement à la lettre, et d'une maniere si rigoureuse, que cela a rendu sa version tout-a-fait barbare. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II.

³⁴ Les Septante qui traduisent souvent l'Ebreu trop à la lettre, et quelquefois même sans prendre garde au sens, ne

“ Hebrew often too literally, and sometimes even
 “ without attending to the sense, do not always
 “ exactly hit the meaning; and they render
 “ themselves obscure, by an excessive attach-
 “ ment to the letter.” Of Arias’ translation he
 says³⁵: “ It is true, that this version may be use-
 “ ful to those who are learning Hebrew, because
 “ it renders the Hebrew word for word, accord-
 “ ing to the grammatical sense; but I do not think
 “ that one ought therefore to give Arias Montanus
 “ the character of *a most faithful interpreter*;
 “ on the contrary, one will do him much more
 “ justice, in naming him *a most trifling inter-
 “ preter.*”

Agreeably to this more enlarged, and, indeed, more accurate way of thinking, the critic did not hesitate to pronounce this expression of Munster: *Fructificate et augete, et implete aquas in fretis*, much inferior to that of the Vulgate, *Crescite et multiplicamini, et implete aquas maris*³⁶. I am of the same opinion as to the passages compared, though I have no partiality to the Vulgate. Yet,

font pas toujours un choix exact du véritable sens, et ils se rendent obscurs, pour s’attacher trop à la lettre. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xiii.

³⁵ Il est vrai que cette version peut être utile à ceux qui veulent apprendre la langue Ebraïque, parce qu’elle rend l’Hebreu mot pour mot, et selon le sens grammatical: mais je ne crois pas qu’on doive donner pour cela à Arias Montanus la qualité de *fidissimus interpres*: au contraire, on lui fera beaucoup plus de justice, en le nommant *ineptissimus interpres*. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xx.

³⁶ Gen. i. 22. Hist. Crit. du V. T. liv. II. ch. xxi.

by Simon's rule, above quoted, Munster's version here ought to be preferred. It is equally intelligible, and more literal. Nor is the word *fructificate* more exceptionable in point of Latinity, than many words in the Vulgate which he strenuously defends; accusing those who object to them, of an excess of delicacy, but ill suited to the subject. His friend, the canon of Ely, if it had been a term of the ancient interpreter, would have told us boldly, and in my opinion, with better reason than when he so expressed himself, *Parum fortasse eleganter verbum פֶּרַו pheru, sic reddidit; sed apposite, ut qui maxime.* The same fault, of being too literal, and sometimes tracing etymologies, he finds in Beza. "What has often deceived Beza," says he³⁷, "and the other translators of Geneva, is their thinking to render the Greek more literally, by attaching themselves to express etymologies. They have not considered that it is proper only for school-boys to translate in this manner." To these let me add the testimony of his apologist, Hieronymus Le Camus³⁸: "When they render the Hebrew,

³⁷ Ce qui a souvent trompé Beze et les autres traducteurs de Geneve, c'est qu'ils ont crû rendre les mots Grecs plus à la lettre, s'ils s'attachoient à exprimer jusqu'aux etymologies. Ils n'ont pas consideré qu'il n'y a que des ecoliers qui soient capables de traduire de cette maniere. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxvi.

³⁸ Quando verba Ebraica ita reddunt, ut verbum de verbo exprimant, minus Græcè loquuntur; et hoc Simonius vocavit *κακοζηλιαν*, seu pravam affectationem Judæis interpretibus

“ word for word, they do not speak pure Greek. “ This Simon calls *κακοζηλια*, or a vicious affectation familiar to Jewish interpreters, and occurring “ sometimes in the Septuagint. Thus, when they “ turn some prepositions from Hebrew into Greek, “ they retain the Hebrew idiom ; for example, in “ Hebrew, the comparative is expressed by the “ preposition *min*, which the Seventy, and Aquila, “ often render *απο*, *from* ; in which case, this “ *κακοζηλια* darkens the sense.” Was there none of this *κακοζηλια* then, in using the preposition *in* (where the idiom of the Latin, and the sense of the expression, required *cum*,) in the phrase *in virtute* of the Vulgate³⁹ ?

§ 16. BUT it is certain that, whatever were his general sentiments on the subject, he no sooner descended to particular instances, than he patronized the free, or the literal, manner, just as the one, or the other, had been followed by the Vulgate. If he had said, in so many words, that the example of the ancient interpreter was a sufficient reason, the question would have been more sim-

familiarem, quæ etiam interdum in septuaginta interpretibus occurrit. Sic dum quasdam prepositiones ex Ebræo faciunt Græcas, retinent dictionem Ebraicam : exempli causâ, sermo Ebraicus comparativum exprimit per *min* quod 70 cum Aquila haud infrequenter reddunt *απο ab*. Tunc ista *κακοζηλια* sensum efficit obscurum. Hier. le Cam. De Responsione Vossii, edit. Edinb. 1685, p. 50.

³⁹ Rom. i. 4. See § 7. of this Dissertation.

ple. But, whatever weight this sentiment might have had with Romanists, to whom that version serves as a standard, it could not surely have had influence enough on Protestants, to make them sacrifice what they judged to be the sense of the unerring Spirit, in deference to the discovered mistakes of a fallible translator. It was, therefore, of importance to Father Simon, for the conviction of his Protestant readers, to show, from the authentic principles of criticism, that, in every thing material, the old translator had judged better than any of the later interpreters: and, in prosecution of this momentous point, I have given a specimen of his wonderful versatility in arguing. That I may not be misunderstood, I must at the same time add, that he does not carry his partiality so far, as to refuse acknowledging, in the Vulgate, a few slips of no consequence, and no wise affecting the sense. To have acted otherwise, would have been too inartificial in that critic, as it would have exposed the great object of his treatise too much. Some concessions it was necessary that he should employ, as an expedient for gaining the acquiescence of his readers in points incomparably more important.

§ 17. I SHALL NOW finish what I have to remark upon his criticisms, with some reflections on those words which, in consequence of the frequency of their occurrence, both in the Vulgate, and in ancient ecclesiastical writers, he considers as

consecrated, and as therefore entitled to be preferred to other words, which are equally significant, but have not had the same advantage of antiquity, and theological use. I readily admit the title claimed in behalf of such words, when they convey exactly the idea denoted by the original terms, and are neither obscure nor ambiguous: nay, I do not object even to their ambiguity, when the same ambiguity is in the original term. And this is, in my opinion, the utmost which ought to be either demanded on one side, or yielded on the other. If, on account of the usage of any former interpreter, I admit words which convey not the same idea with the original, or which convey it darkly, or which convey also other ideas that may be mistaken for the true, or confounded with it; I make a sacrifice of the truths of the Spirit, that I may pay a vain compliment to antiquity, in adopting its phraseology, even when it may mislead. That the words themselves be equally plain and pertinent with any other words which might occur, appears to me so reasonable a limitation to the preference granted in favour of those used in any former version, that, if the bare stating of the matter, as is done above, be not sufficient; I do not know any topic by which I could convince persons who are of a different opinion. But, perhaps, it will answer better to descend to particulars. It is only thus a person can be assured of making himself thoroughly understood.

§ 18. SIMON, speaking of the Lutheran and Port Royal versions, says ⁴⁰, “ Neither of them retains “ almost any thing of that venerable and quite “ divine appearance which Scripture has in the “ original languages. One does not find, in these “ versions, that simplicity of style which is dif- “ fused through the writings of the Apostles and “ Evangelists. This appears from the first words “ of the translation of Mons, where we read, *La* “ *genealogie de Jesus Christ* : in effect, the two “ Latin words, *liber generationis*, answering to “ two others in the Greek, signify *genealogy*. “ But an interpreter, who chooses to preserve that “ simple air which the sacred books have in the “ original tongues, will rather translate, simply, “ *the book of the generation*. He will remark, at “ the same time, on the margin, that in the style “ of the Bible, one calls $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\omicron\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, what

⁴⁰ Les uns et les autres ne retiennent presque rien de cet air venerable et tout divin que l'Écriture a dans les langues originales. On n'y trouve point cette simplicité de stile qui est repandue dans les écrits des Évangélistes et des Apôtres.— Cela paroît dès les premiers mots de la traduction de Mons, où nous lisons, *la genealogie de Jesus Christ* : et en effet ces deux mots Latins, *liber generationis*, qui repondent à deux autres qui sont dans le Grec, signifient *genealogie*. Mais un interprete qui voudra conserver cet air simple que les livres sacrés ont dans les langues originales, aimera mieux traduire simplement *le livre de la generation*. Il remarquera en même tems à la marge, que dans le stile de la bible on appelle $\beta\iota\beta\lambda\omicron\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ce que les Grecs nomment *γενεαλογια*, *genealogie* ; que les Apôtres ont pris cette expression de la version Grecque des Septante, qui ont ainsi interpreté le *sepher-toldoth* des Ebreux. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

“ the Greeks name *γενεαλογια*, *genealogy* ; that
 “ the Apostles have adopted this expression from
 “ the Greek version of the Seventy, who have thus
 “ expressed the *sepher-toldoth* of the Hebrews.”

Now it may be observed, that Simon himself speaks of it as unquestionable, that *genealogie* expresses the meaning. But he objects, that it is not so simple an expression as *le livre de la generation*. If he had called it too learned a term for ushering in so plain a narrative as the Gospel, I should have thought the objection plausible. But when he speaks of simplicity, I am afraid that he has some meaning to that word which I am not acquainted with. I should never imagine, that of different ways of expressing the same idea, supposing the expressions in other respects equal, that should be accounted the least simple, which is in the fewest words. Or, if the phrase, *le livre de la generation*, do not derive its superior simplicity from its being more complex ; does it derive that quality from its being more obscure than *la genealogie* ? I have been accustomed to consider plainness, rather than obscurity, as characteristic of simplicity. And, indeed, the chief fault I find in the former of these expressions, is its obscurity. The word *livre* is here used in a sense which it never has in French ; as much may be said of the word *generation* : and consequently the phrase does not convey intelligibly the idea of the writer, or, indeed, any idea whatever. Our author's answer to this is : ‘ Give the sense on the margin ;’ that is, in other words, give the etymology of the phrase in the text, and

the translation in the margin. Is not this the very method taken by Arias Montanus, whom our critic has, nevertheless, treated very contemptuously? Is not this hunting after etymological significations, the very thing he condemns so strongly in Beza, and some other modern interpreters? And where is the difference, whether the expression to be explained, be a phrase or a compound word: for a compound word is no other than a contracted phrase? *Γενεαλογια* is but two words, *γενεας λογος*, contracted into one. This our author admits to be a just (and, I add, a literal) version of *sepher toldoth*. Now, if the Evangelist had employed this, instead of *βιβλος γενεσεως*, Simon would have had the same reason for insisting that it ought to be rendered, in the text, *la parole de la generation*, and that the meaning should be explained in the margin. d

Sometimes, indeed, this way of interpreting, by tracing the etymology, is proper, because sometimes it conveys the sense with sufficient perspicuity, and with as much brevity as the language admits: but this is not the case always. Every body will allow, that *φιληδονοι* could not be more justly rendered than *lovers of pleasure*, or *φιλοθεοι*, than *lovers of God*. But *συκοφανται* is much better translated *false accusers*, than *informers concerning figs*; *φιλοσοφοι*, *philosophers*, than *lovers of wisdom*. The apostolical admonition ⁴¹, *Βλεπετε μη τις υμας εσται ο*

⁴¹ Col. ii. 8.

συλαγωγῶν δια τῆς φιλοσοφίας, is certainly better rendered, *Beware lest any man seduce you through philosophy*, than, *Beware lest any man carry you off a prey, through the love of wisdom*; which, though it traces the letter, does not give the sense. Yet, in these cases, the terms may be pertinently explained in the margin, as well as in that mentioned by the critic. Now, to qualify one for the office of interpreter, it is requisite that he be capable of giving the received use of the phrases, as well as of the compound words, and of the compound words, as well as of the simple words.

There are cases in which I have acknowledged, that recourse to the margin is necessary; but such cases are totally different from the present, as will appear to the satisfaction of any one who has attended to what has been said⁴², on that subject. But the method, so often recommended by Simon, is, in my apprehension, the most bungling imaginable. It is unnaturally to disjoin two essential parts of the translator's business, the interpretation of words, and the interpretation of idioms, or phrases, allotting the text, or body of the book, for the one, and reserving the margin for the other. In consequence of which, the text will be often no better than a collection of riddles, or what is worse, a jargon of unmeaning words; whilst that which alone deserves the name of interpretation, will be found in the margin. This naturally suggests a query, Whether

⁴² Diss. II. Part I. § 5. Diss. VIII. throughout.

the text might not as well be dispensed with altogether; as it would only serve to interrupt a reader's progress, distract his attention, and divide his thoughts? To this let me add another query, Whether there be any thing in the translations of Aquila, Malvenda, Arias Montanus, Pagnin, and Beza (for they all incur this stigma from our author, when they translate more literally than the Vulgate,) which better deserves the denomination of a school-boy's version, than that which the author, in this place, so strongly patronizes?

§ 19. I OBSERVED, that compound words are nearly on the same footing with such phrases as *βιβλος γενεσεως*. This holds more manifestly in Hebrew, where the nouns which are said, by their grammarians, to be *in statu constructo*, are, in effect, compound terms. To combine them the more easily, a change is, in certain cases, made on the letters of the word which we should call the governing word; and when there is no change in the letters, there is often, by the Masoretic reading, a change in the vowel-points to facilitate the pronunciation of them as one word. In this way, *sepher-toldoth* is as truly one compound word in Hebrew, as *γενεαλογια* is in Greek, and of the same signification. There is a similar idiom in the French language, for supplying names, by what may be termed, indifferently, phrases, or compound nouns. Such are, *gens d'armes*, *jet d'eau*, *aide de camp*. We should think a translator had much of the *κακοζηλια*,

the vicious affectation so oft above mentioned, who should render them into English, *people of arms, cast of water, help of field*. Another evidence that this may justly be regarded as a kind of composition in Hebrew, is that, when there is occasion for the affix pronouns, though their connection be in strictness with the first of the two terms, they are annexed to the second, which would be utterly repugnant to their syntax, if both were not considered as making but one word, and, consequently, as not admitting the insertion of a pronoun between them. Thus, what is rendered⁴³, *his idols of silver*, and *his idols of gold*; if the two nouns in each phrase were not conceived as combined into one compound term, ought to be translated, *idols of his silver*, and *idols of his gold*, זחבו את אלילי כספו, ואת אלילי, which is not according to the genius of that language, for the affix pronouns are never transposed.

But when the words are considered in this (which I think is the true) light, as one compound name, there is the same reason for rendering them as our interpreters have done, that there would be to render ἡ φιλανθρωπια αυτου, *his love to men*, and not *love to his men*. In the same manner, שם קדשי *shem kodshi*, is *my holy name*, הר קדשי *har kodshi*, *my holy mountain*, and קדשי שמן *shemen kodshi*, *my holy oil*. These, if we should follow the letter in translating them, or, which is the same thing, trace the form of the

⁴³ Isaiah, ii. 20.

composition, must be, *the name of my holiness, the mountain of my holiness, and the oil of my holiness*. In translating אֱלֹהֵי צְדִקָּי⁴⁴ *elohe tsidki*, rendered, in the common version, *O God of my righteousness*, I see no occasion, with Dr. Taylor, to make a stretch to find a meaning to the word answering to *righteousness*; the word, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom above exemplified, has there manifestly the force of an epithet, and the expression implies no more than *my righteous God*. In this way עַם קִדְשׁ⁴⁵ *gham kodshecha* (which is exactly similar,) translated in the English Bible, after Tremellius, and much in the manner of Arias, *the people of thy holiness*, is rendered in the Vulgate, and by Houbigant, *populum sanctum tuum, thy holy people*, and to the same purpose by Castalio and the translator of Zurich. This very thing, therefore, that the Seventy did not render *sepher-toldoth, γενεαλογία*, to which it literally, and in signification, answers, but *βιβλος γενεσεως*, is an example of that *κακοζηλια*, of which Jerom justly accuses them, and which Simon never fails to censure with severity, in every translation where he finds it, except the Vulgate. As this phrase, however, in consequence of its introduction by these interpreters, obtained a currency among the Hellenist Jews, and was quite intelligible to them, being in the national idiom, it was proper in the Evangelist, or his translator, to adopt it. The case was totally different with those for whom the Latin version was made,

⁴⁴ Psalm, iv. 1.⁴⁵ Isaiah, lxiii. 18.

whose idiom the words *liber generationis*, did not suit, and to whose ears they conveyed only unmeaning sounds.

§ 20. I HAVE never seen Mr. Simon's French translation of the New Testament from the Vulgate, but I have an English version of his version, by William Webster, curate of St. Dunstan's in the West. The English translator professes, in his dedication, to have translated literally from the French. Yet Matthew's Gospel begins in this manner: *The genealogy of Jesus Christ*. If Mr. Webster has taken the freedom to alter Simon's phrase, he has acted very strangely, as it is hardly in the power of imagination to conceive a good reason for turning that work (which is itself but a translation of a translation) into English; unless to show, as nearly as possible, that eminent critic's manner of applying his own rules, and to let us into his notions of the proper method of translating holy writ. And if, on the other hand, Simon has actually rendered it in French, *La genealogie*, it is no less strange that, without assigning a reason for his change of opinion, or so much as mentioning, in the preface, or in a note, that he had changed it, he should employ an expression which he had, in a work of high reputation, censured with so much severity in another⁴⁶.

⁴⁶ I have, since these Dissertations were finished, been fortunate enough to procure a copy of Simon's French translation of the New Testament; from which I find that his

§ 21. Now if, from what has been said, it be evident, that his own principles, explicitly declared in numberless parts of his book, as well as right reason, condemn the servile method of tracing etymologies in words or phrases (for there is no material difference in the cases,) to the manifest injury of perspicuity, and, consequently, of the sense; I know no tolerable plea which can be advanced in favour of such phrases, unless that to which he often recurs in other cases, *consecration by long use*. “Why,” he asks⁴⁷, speaking of the Port Royal translation, “have they banished from this version many words

English translator has not misrepresented him. Without any apology either in the preface or in the notes, he adopts the very expression which he had in so decisive a manner condemned in the Gentlemen of Port Royal. Nay, so little does he value the rule which he had so often prescribed to others, to give a literal version in the text, and the meaning in the margin, that in most cases, as in the present, he reverses it; he gives the meaning in the text, and the literal version in the margin. I think that, in so doing, he judges much better; but, if further experience produced this alteration in his sentiments, it is strange that he seems never to have reflected that he owed to the public some account of so glaring an inconsistency in his conduct; and to those translators whose judgment he had treated with so little ceremony, an acknowledgment of his error. Simon’s translation is, upon the whole, a good one, but it will not bear to be examined by his own rules and maxims.

⁴⁷ Pourquoi a-t-on banni plusieurs mots qu’un long usage a autorisés, et qui ont été, pour ainsi dire, canonisés dans les eglises d’Occident? Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

“ which long use has authorized, and which have
 “ been, so to speak, canonized in the Western
 “ churches ?” He does not, indeed, plead this
 in defence of the words *liber generationis*, though,
 in my opinion, the most plausible argument
 he had to offer. But, as it is a principal topic
 with him, to which he often finds it necessary
 to recur, it will require a more particular exami-
 nation.

§ 22. “ WHERE we have, in the Greek,” says
 he,⁴⁸ “ *εὐαγγελίζονται*, and in the Vulgate *evan-
 gelicantur*, Erasmus has translated, “ *Lætum*
evangelii accipiunt nuntium. He explains, by
 “ several words, what might have been rendered
 “ by one only, which is not, indeed, Latin, but,
 “ as the learned John Bois remarks, it is ancient,
 “ and is, besides, as current as several other
 “ words which ecclesiastic use has rendered
 “ familiar. He adds, in the same place, that he
 “ is not shocked with this expression in our Vul-
 “ gate, *qui non fuerit scandalizatus*, because he
 “ is for allowing the Gospel to speak after its own
 “ manner. Erasmus has translated, *Quisquis non*
 “ *fuerit offensus*, which is better Latin.” In re-
 gard to the last expression, he has a similar
 remark in his critique on the version of

⁴⁸ Ou il y a dans le Grec (Mat. xi. 5.) *εὐαγγελίζονται*, et dans la Vulgate *evangelizantur*, Erasme a traduit *letum Evangelii accipiunt nuntium*. Il explique par plusieurs mots ce qu'il pouvoit rendre par un seul, qui n'est pas à la vérité Latin,

Mons. "These words," says he ⁴⁹, "*Si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te*, the Gentlemen of Port Royal have translated, *Si votre œil droit vous est un sujet de scandale et de chute*. They say that the word *scandale*, by itself, conveys commonly another idea, denoting that which shocks us, not that which makes us fall. But St. Jerom, whom they pretend to imitate, was not so delicate. We should not, however, have found fault with their explaining the word *scandale*, scandal, by the word *chute*, fall: but this explanation ought to have been in the margin, rather than in the text of the version."

§ 23. As to what regards the proper version of

mais, comme le docte Jean Bois a remarqué, il est ancien, et il est aussi bien de mise que plusieurs autres mots auxquels l'usage de l'église a donné cours. Il ajoute au même endroit, qu'il n'est point choqué de cette expression qui est dans nôtre Vulgate, *qui non fuerit scandalizatus*, parce qu'il souffre volontiers que l'Évangile parle à sa manière. Erasme a traduit, *quisquis non fuerit offensus*; ce qui est plus Latin. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxii.

⁴⁹ Ces paroles (Mat. v. 29.) *Si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te*, Messieurs de Port Royale ont traduit par celles-ci, *Si votre œil droit vous est un sujet de scandale et de chute*. Ils disent que le mot de *scandale* tout seul donne d'ordinaire une autre idée, et qu'ils se prend pour ce qui nous fait choquer, et non pas pour ce qui nous fait tomber. Mais St. Jérôme qu'ils prétendent imiter, n'a point eu cette délicatesse. On ne trouve pas néanmoins mauvais qu'ils aient expliqué le mot de *scandale* par celui de *chute*: mais cette explication devoit plutôt être à la marge, que dans le texte de la version. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxxv.

the words *εὐαγγελίζω* and *εὐαγγέλιον*, I have explained myself fully in some former dissertations⁵⁰, and shall only add here a few things suggested by the remarks above quoted. First, then, Mr. Simon condemns it much in a translator, to explain, by several words, what might have been rendered by one only. I condemn it no less than he. But, by the examples produced, one would conclude that he had meant, not *what might have been*, but *what could not have been*, rendered by one only; for *evangelizantur* is not a version of *εὐαγγελίζονται*, nor *scandalizatus fuerit* of *σκανδαλισθη*. This is merely to give the Greek words something of a Latin form, and so evade translating them altogether. A version composed on this plan, if, without absurdity, we could call it a version, would be completely barbarous and unintelligible. There are a very few cases wherein it is necessary to retain the original term. These I have described already⁵¹. But neither of the words now mentioned falls under the description. And common sense is enough to satisfy us, that when a word cannot be translated intelligibly by one word only, the interpreter ought to employ more. *Verba ponderanda sunt*, says Houbigant⁵², *non numeranda—Neque enim fieri potest, ut duarum linguarum paria semper verba paribus respondeant.*

Secondly, That a word is familiar to us, is no evidence that we understand it, though this cir-

⁵⁰ Diss. V. Part II. Diss. VI. Part V.

⁵¹ Diss. VIII. passim.

⁵² Proleg. Cap. V. Art. III.

cumstance, its familiarity, often prevents our discovering that we do not understand it.

Thirdly, Ecclesiastical use is no security that the word, though it be understood, conveys to us the same idea which the original term did to those to whom the gospels were first promulgated. In a former Dissertation⁵³, the fullest evidence has been given that, in regard to several words, the meaning which has been long established by ecclesiastic use, is very different from that which they have in the writings of the New Testament.

Fourthly, That to render the plain Greek words *σκανδαλιζω* and *ευαγγελιζω* into Latin, by the words *scandalizo* and *evangelizo*, which are not Latin words, is so far from allowing the Gospel to speak after its own manner (as Bois calls it,) that it is, on the contrary, giving it a manner of speaking the most different from its own that can be imagined. This I intend soon to evince, even from Simon himself, though, in the passage above referred to, he seems to have adopted the sentiment of the English critic.

Lastly, The argument implied in the remark, that Jerom had not so much delicacy as the translators of Port Royal, because he did not scruple to employ the word *scandalizo*, though not Latin, in his Latin version, admits a twofold answer. The first is, Jerom did wrong in so doing. Simon acknowledges that he was neither infallible nor inspired; he acknowledges, further, that he might,

⁵³ Diss. IX.

and, in a few instances, did, mistake, and is, by consequence, not implicitly to be followed. "It would be wrong," says the critic, in a passage formerly quoted, "to imitate the faults of St. Jerom, and to pay greater deference to his authority than to the truth." The second answer is, that the cases are not parallel. *Scandalum* was not a Latin word; consequently, to those who understood no Greek, it was obscure, or, if you will, unintelligible. This is the worst that could be said. Jerom, or whoever first introduced it into the Latin version, had it in his power to assign it, in a note, what sense he pleased. But *scandale* was a French word before the translators of Mons had a being; and it was not in their power to divert it from the meaning which general use had given it long before. Now, as they justly observe, in their own vindication, the import of the French word did not coincide with that of the original; they were, therefore, by all the rules of interpretation, obliged to adopt another. Jerom, by adopting the word *scandalum* darkened the meaning; they, by using the word *scandale*, would have given a false meaning. Their only fault, in my opinion, was their admitting an improper word into their version, even though coupled with another which expresses the sense.

§ 24. BUT, as our author frequently recurs to this topic, the consecration of such words by long use, it will be proper to consider it more narrowly. Some have gone further, on this article, than our

author is willing to justify. "Sutor," says he⁵⁴, "pretended, that it was not more allowable to make new translations of the Bible, than to change the style of Cicero into another. *Nonne injuriam faceret Tullio, qui ejus stylum immutare vellet?* But, by the leave of this Parisian theologian," says Simon, "there is a great difference between reforming the style of a book, and making a version of that book. One may make a translation of the New Testament from the Greek, or from the Latin, without making any change on that Greek or that Latin." The justness of this sentiment is self-evident; and it is a necessary consequence from it, that if the words and phrases in the version convey the same ideas and thoughts to the readers, which those of the original convey, it is a just translation, whatever conformity or disconformity in sound and etymology there may be between its words and phrases, and the words and phrases of the original, or of other translations.

Of this Simon appears, on several occasions, to be perfectly sensible, insomuch that he has, on

⁵⁴ Sutor pretendoit qu'il n'etoit pas plus permis de faire de nouvelles traductions de la Bible, que de changer le stile de Cicero en un autre. *Nonne injuriam faceret Tullio qui ejus stylum immutare vellet?* Mais n'en déplaie à ce theologien de Paris, il y a bien de la difference entre reformer le stile d'un livre, et faire une version de ce même livre. On peut faire une traduction de Nouveau Testament sur le Grec, ou sur le Latin, sans toucher à ce Grec, ni à ce Latin. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxi.

this very article, taken up the defence of Castalio against Beza, who had attacked, with much acrimony, the innovations of the former, in point of language. "It is not, as Beza very well said," (I quote Beza here as quoted by Simon⁵⁵), "so much my opinion as that of the ablest ecclesiastic writers, who, when they discourse with the greatest elegance concerning sacred things, make no alteration on the passages of Scripture which they quote." Though this verdict of Beza is introduced with manifest approbation, *dit-il fort bien*, and though, in confirmation of it, he adds, that both Beza and Castalio have taken, in this respect, unpardonable liberties, yet it is very soon followed by such a censure as, in my opinion, invalidates the whole. "There is, nevertheless," says he⁵⁶, "some

⁵⁵ Ce n'est pas, dit il fort bien, tant mon sentiment, que celui des plus habiles ecrivains ecclesiastiques, lesquels, quand même ils parlent avec le plus de politesse des choses sacrées, ne changent rien dans les passages de l'Ecriture qu'ils citent. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

⁵⁶ Il y a néanmoins de l'exaggeration dans ce reproche. Car il n'est ici question que de la version des livres sacrés, et non pas de l'original : et ainsi l'on ne peut pas objecter à Castalio, comme fait Beze, d'avoir changé les paroles du Saint Esprit, ou, comme il parle, *divinam illam Spiritus Sancti eloquentiam*. Il est certain que le Saint Esprit, pour me servir des termes des ministres de Geneve, n'a point parlé Latin. C'est pourquoi Castalio a pû mettre dans sa traduction Latine *lotio* et *genii* au lieu de *baptisma* et *angeli*, sans rien changer pour cela dans les expressions du Saint Esprit. Hist. Crit. des Versions du N. T. ch. xxiv.

“ exaggeration in this reproach. For the question
“ here is about the version of the sacred books,
“ and not about the original ; so that one cannot
“ object to Castalio, as Beza does, his having
“ changed the words of the Holy Spirit, or, as
“ he expresses it, *divinam illam Spiritus Sancti*
“ *eloquentiam*. It is certain, to adopt the style of
“ the ministers of Geneva, that the Holy Spirit
“ did not speak Latin. Wherefore, Castalio might
“ well put, in his Latin translation, *lotio* and *genii*,
“ instead of *baptisma* and *angeli*, without chang-
“ ing aught in the expressions of the Holy
“ Spirit.” The moderation and justness of his
sentiments here, do not well accord, either with
the high claims which, in favour of ecclesiastic
terms, he makes to consecration, canonization, &c.
or with the accusations brought, on this very arti-
cle, against Erasmus and others.

Wherein does the expression of Theodore Beza, in calling those ancient words and phrases of the Vulgate, *divinam illam Spiritus Sancti eloquentiam*, differ, in import, from that given by John Bois, who says, in reference to them, *Libenter audio Scripturam suo quidem modo, suoque velut idiomate loquentem?* May it not be replied, just as pertinently to Bois as to Beza : “ The question here, is about the version
“ of the sacred books, and not about the original.
“ It is certain, that as the Holy Spirit did not
“ speak Latin, the Scriptures were not written in
“ that language.” Their phrases and idioms,
therefore, are not concerned in the dispute ; for,
if those expressions, concerning which we are

now inquiring, be not the language of the Holy Spirit, as Simon himself maintains that they are not ; neither are they the language of the Scriptures. Thus, the same sentiment, with an inconsiderable difference in the expression, is quoted by our author, with high approbation from the canon of Ely, as worthy of being turned into a general rule⁵⁷, and with no little censure from the minister of Geneva.

§ 25. I HAVE often had occasion to speak of the obscurity of such terms, and I have shown⁵⁸ the impropriety of several of them, as conveying ideas very different from those conveyed by the words of the original, rightly understood : and though this alone would be a sufficient reason for setting them aside, sufficient, I mean, to any person who makes more account of obtaining the mind of the Spirit, than of acquiring the dialect of uninspired interpreters ; the very reason for which the use of them is so strenuously urged by Simon and others, appears to me a very weighty reason against employing them. They are, say these critics, consecrated words ; that is, in plain language, they are, by the use of ecclesiastic writers, become a sort of technical terms in theology. This is really the fact. Accordingly, those words hardly enter into common use at

⁵⁷ Cette reflexion doit servir de regle pour une infinité d'endroits du Nouveau Testament, ou les nouveaux traducteurs ont affecté de s'eloigner de l'ancienne edition Latine. Ibid. ch. xxii.

⁵⁸ Diss. IX. throughout.

all. They are appropriated as terms of art, which have no relation to the ordinary commerce of life. Now, nothing can be more repugnant to the character of the diction employed by the sacred writers; there being, in their language, nothing to which we can apply the words scholastic or technical. On the contrary, the inspired penmen always adopted such terms as were, on the most common occurrences, in familiar use with their readers. When the Evangelist tells us in Greek⁵⁹, that the angel said to the shepherds, *Ευαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν*, he represents him as speaking in as plain terms to all who understood Greek, as one who says in English, *I bring you good news*, speaks to those who understand English. But will it be said that the Latin interpreter spoke as plainly to every reader of Latin, when he said *Evangelizo vobis*? Or does that deserve to be called a version, which conveys neither the matter, nor the manner, of the author? Not the matter, because an unintelligible word conveys no meaning; not the manner, because what the author said simply and familiarly, the translator says scholastically and pedantically. Of this, however, I do not accuse Jerom. The phrase in question was, doubtless, one of those which he did not think it prudent to meddle with.

§ 26. NOR will their method of obviating all difficulties, by means of the margin, ever satisfy a reasonable person. Is it proper, in translating an

⁵⁹ Luke, ii. 10.

author, to make a piece of patchwork of the version, by translating one word, and mis-translating, or leaving untranslated, another, with perpetual references to the margin, for correcting the blunders intentionally committed in the text? And if former translators have, from superstition, from excessive deference to their predecessors, from fear of giving offence, or from any other motive, been induced to adopt so absurd a method, shall we think ourselves obliged to imitate them? Some seem strangely to imagine, that to have, in the translation, as many as possible of the articulate sounds, the letters and syllables of the original, is to be very literal, and, consequently, very close. If any choose to call this literal, I should think it idle to dispute with him about the word; but I could not help observing that, in this way, a version may be very literal, and perfectly foreign from the purpose. Nobody will question that the English word *pharmacy* is immediately derived from the Greek *φαρμακεια*, of which it retains almost all the letters. Ought we, for that reason, to render the Greek word *φαρμακεια*, *pharmacy*, in the catalogue the Apostle has given us of the works of the flesh⁶⁰? Must we render *παροξυσμος*⁶¹ *paroxysm*, and *παραδοξα*⁶² *paradoxes*? *Idiot* is, by this rule, a literal version of the Greek *ιδιωτης*. But an interpreter would be thought not much above that character, who should render it so, in several places of Scripture⁶³. Yet if this be not

⁶⁰ Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. ⁶¹ Acts, xv. 39. ⁶² Luke, v. 26.

⁶³ Acts, iv. 13. 1 Cor. xiv. 16. 23. 24. 2 Cor. xi. 6.

exhibiting what Beza denominates *divinam illam Spiritus sancti eloquentiam* : or what Bois, with no better reason, calls *Scripturam suo quidem modo, suoque velt idiomate loquentem*, it will not be easy to assign an intelligible meaning to these phrases.

But, if such be the proper exhibition of the eloquence of the Spirit, and of the idiom of Scripture, it will naturally occur to ask, Why have we so little, even in the Vulgate, of this divine eloquence? Why do we so seldom hear the Scripture, even there, speak in its own way, and in its native idiom? It would have been easy to mutilate all, or most of the Greek words, forming them in the same manner as *evangelizatus* and *scandalizatus* are formed, and so to turn the whole into a gibberish, that would have been neither Greek nor Latin, though it might have had something of the articulation of the one language, and of the structure of the other. But it is an abuse of speech, to call a jargon of words, wherein we have nothing but a resemblance in sound, without sense, the eloquence of the Holy Spirit, or the idiom of the Scriptures.

It is sometimes made the pretence for retaining the original word, that it has different significations, and, therefore, an interpreter, by preferring one of these, is in danger of hurting the sense. Thus, the Rhemish translators, who render *αλλον παρακλητον δωσει υμιν*⁶⁴, *He will give you another paraclete*, subjoin this note : “ *Paraclete*, by inter-

⁶⁴ John, xiv. 16.

“pretation, is either a comforter, or an advocate; and, therefore, to translate it by any one of them only, is, perhaps, to abridge the sense of this place:” to which Fulke, who publishes their New Testament along with the then common version, answers very pertinently, in the note immediately following: “If you will not translate any words that have diverse significations, you must leave five hundred more untranslated than you have done.” But there is not even this poor pretence for all the consecrated barbarisms. The verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* never occurs in the Gospels in any sense but one, a sense easily expressed in the language of every people.

§ 27. IT may be replied, ‘If you will not admit with Beza, that this mode of writing is the eloquence of the Spirit, or with Bois, that it is the idiom of Scripture, you must at least allow, with Melancthon, that it is the language and style of the church: *Nos loquamur cum ecclesia. Ne pudeat nos materni sermonis. Ecclesia est mater nostra. Sic autem loquitur ecclesia.*’ This comes indeed nearer the point in hand. The language of the Latin church is, in many things, founded in the style introduced by the ancient interpreters. But it ought to be remembered, that even the Latin church herself does not present those interpreters to us as infallible, or affirm that their language is irreprehensible. And if she herself has been any how induced to adopt a style that is not well calculated for conveying the mind of the Lord; nay, which in many things

darkens, and in some misrepresents it, shall we make less account of communicating clearly the truths revealed by the Spirit, than of perpetuating a phraseology which contributes to the advancement of ignorance, and of an implicit deference, in spiritual matters, to human authority? On the contrary, if the church has, in process of time, contracted somewhat of a Babylonish dialect, and thereby lost a great deal of her primitive simplicity, purity, and plainness of manner; her language cannot be too soon cleared of the unnatural mixture, and we cannot too soon restore her native idiom. To act thus is so far from being imputable to the love of novelty, that it results from that veneration of antiquity which leads men to ask for the old paths, and makes the votaries of the true religion desirous to return to the undisguised sentiments, manner, and style of holy writ, which are evidently more ancient than the oldest of those canonized corruptions. This is not to relinquish, it is to return to the true idiom of Scripture: with as little propriety is such a truly primitive manner charged with the want of simplicity. A technical or learned style is of all styles the least entitled to be called *simple*: for it is the least fitted for conveying instruction to the simple, to *babes* in knowledge, the character by which those to whom the Gospel was first published, were particularly distinguished⁶⁵. Whereas the tendency of a scholastic phraseology, is, on the

⁶⁵ Matth. xi. 25. Luke, x. 21.

contrary, to hide divine things from babes and simple persons, and to reveal them only to sages and scholars. Never, therefore, was controvertist more unlucky in his choice of arguments than our opponents, on this article, are, in urging the plea of simplicity, and that of Scripture idiom, topics manifestly subversive of their cause.

§ 28. THE impropriety of changing, on any pretext, the consecrated terms, and the impropriety of giving to the people, within the pale of the Roman church, any translation of Scripture into their mother-tongue, unless from the Vulgate, are topics to which Father Simon frequently recurs. And, it must be acknowledged that, on his hypothesis, which puts the authority of tradition on the same foot with that of Scripture, and makes the church the depositary and interpreter of both, there appears a suitableness in his doctrine. He admits, however, that the translation she has adopted, is not entirely exempted from errors, though free from such as affect the articles of faith, or rules of practice. This propriety of translating only from the Vulgate, he maintains from this single consideration, its being that which is read for Scripture daily in their churches.

Now this argument is of no weight with Protestants, and appears not to be entitled to much weight even with Roman Catholics. If there be no impropriety in their being supplied with an exact version of what is read in their churches; neither is there any impropriety in their being supplied with an exact version of what was writ-

ten by the inspired penmen, for the instruction of the first Christians. This appears as reasonable, and as laudable, an object of curiosity, even to Romanists, as the other. Nay, I should think this, even on Simon's own principles, defensible. The sacred penmen were infallible, so was not the ancient interpreter. He will reply, 'But ye have not the very hand-writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. There are different readings in different Greek copies. Ye are not, therefore, absolutely certain of the conformity of your Greek in every thing, any more than we are of our Latin, to those original writings.' This we admit, but still insist that there is a difference. The Latin has been equally exposed with the Greek to the blunders of transcribers. And as, in some things, different Greek copies read differently, we receive that version, with other ancient translations, to assist us, in doubtful cases, to discover the true reading. But the Vulgate, with every other version, labours under this additional disadvantage that, along with the errors arising from the blunders of copiers, it has those also arising from the mistakes of the interpreter.

§ 29. BUT, in fact, the secret reason both for preserving the consecrated terms, and for translating only from the Vulgate, is no other than to avoid, as much as possible, whatever might suggest to the people, that the Spirit says one thing and the Church another. It is not according to the true principles of ecclesiastical policy, that

such differences should be exposed to the vulgar. This the true sons of the church have discovered long ago. "Gardiner," says bishop Burnet⁶⁶, "had a singular conceit. He fancied there were many words in the New Testament of such majesty that they were not to be translated, but must stand in the English Bible as they were in the Latin. A hundred of these he put into a writing, which was read in convocation. His design in this was visible, that if a translation must be made, it should be so daubed all through with Latin words, that the people should not understand it much the better for its being in English. A taste of this the reader may have by the first twenty of them; *ecclesia, pœnitentia, pontifex, ancilla, contritus, olocausta, justitia, justificatio, idiota, elementa, baptizare, martyr, adorare, sandalium, simplex, tetrarcha, sacramentum, simulacrum, gloria*. The design he had of keeping some of these, particularly the last save one, is plain enough, that the people might not discover that visible opposition which was between the Scriptures and the Roman church, in the matter of images. This could not be better palliated, than by disguising these places with words that the people understood not." Thus far the bishop.

§ 30. It would not be easy to conjecture why Gardiner, that zealous opposer of the reformation,

⁶⁶ History of the Reformation in England, book iii. year 1542.

selected some of the words above mentioned as proper to be retained, unless by their number and frequent recurrence, to give an uncouth and exotic appearance to the whole translation. In regard to others of them, as the bishop justly remarks, the reason is obvious. And it is to be regretted that that historian has not inserted in his valuable work the whole catalogue. Nothing could serve better to expose the latent but genuine purpose of the consecrated terms. Not that any judicious person can be at a loss to discover it; but the more numerous the examples are, the evidence is the stronger. The meaning of common words is learnt solely from common usage, but the import of canonized words can be got only from canonical usage. We all know what an *image* is, it being a word in familiar use; we therefore find no difficulty in discovering what we are forbidden to worship, by the command which forbids the worship of images. Whereas, had the word *simulacrūm*, quite unused before, been substituted for image, it would have, doubtless, acquired a currency on theological subjects; but, being confined to these, would have been no better than a technical term in theology, for the meaning of which, recourse must be had to men of the profession. Nor would it have required of the casuist any metaphysical acuteness in distinguishing, to satisfy those whom he taught to worship *images*, that they were in no danger of adoring a *simulacrum*.

§ 31. To prevent mistakes, it may not be improper to observe, that the word *simulacrum* in

the Vulgate itself is no more a term of art than *similitudo* or *imago* are ; for they are all words in familiar use in Latin ; but *simulacrum* is not in familiar use in English, though *similitudo* and *image* are, which are both formed from Latin words of the same signification. It is not, therefore, their affinity, or even identity in respect of sound, but their difference in respect of use, which stamps nearly related words, or what we call convertible terms, with these different characters, in different languages. Thus *εναγγελιζω* and *σκανδαλιζω* are common, not technical, terms, in the Greek New Testament : but *evangelizo* and *scandalizo* in the Vulgate are the reverse, technical, not common. Now it is for this reason, I say, that to adopt, without necessity, such terms in a language to which they do not belong, and in which consequently they are unknown, or known merely as professional terms, is to form a style the very reverse of what I should call the eloquence of the Holy Spirit, and the proper idiom of the Scriptures. For a greater contrast to the plain and familiar idiom of Scripture, and the eloquence of the Spirit, addressed entirely to the people, than a style that is justly denominated dark, learned, and technical, it is impossible to conceive.

Let it be observed, therefore, that it is the use, not the etymology, to which, in translating, we ought to have respect, either in adopting, or in rejecting, an expression. A word is neither the better, nor the worse, for its being of Greek, or Latin origin. But our first care ought to be, that

it convey the same meaning with the original term; the second, that it convey it as nearly as possible in the same manner, that is, with the same plainness, simplicity, and perspicuity. If this can be done, with equal advantage, by terms which have obtained the sanction of ecclesiastic use, such terms ought to be preferred. For this reason I prefer *just* to virtuous, *redeemer* to ransomer, *saviour* to deliverer. But if the same meaning be not conveyed by them, or not conveyed in the same manner, they ought to be rejected. Otherwise, the real dictates of the Spirit, and the unadulterated idiom of Scripture, are sacrificed to the shadowy resemblance, in sound, and etymology, of technical words, and scholastic phrases.

§ 32. SUCH, upon the whole, are my sentiments of the regard which, in translating holy writ into modern languages, is due to the practice of former translators, especially of the authors of the Latin Vulgate. And such, in particular, is my notion of those words which, by some critics, are called *consecrated*, and, which, in general, in respect of the sense, will not be found the most eligible; nay, by the use of which, there is greater hazard of deserting that plainness, and that simplicity, which are the best characteristics of the Scripture style, than by any other means I know.

54 = Feb. 23, 1833.
27

PART II.

THE REGARD DUE TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

HAVING been so particular in the discussion of the first part of this inquiry, namely, the regard which, in translating the Scriptures, is due to the manner wherein the words and phrases have been rendered by the authors of the Vulgate, it will not be necessary to enter so minutely into the second part, concerning the regard which an English translator owes to the expressions adopted in the common translation. The reasons for adopting, or for rejecting, many of them are so nearly the same in both cases, that, to avoid prolixity by unnecessary repetitions, I shall confine myself to a few observations, to which the special circumstances affecting the common English version, naturally give rise.

§ 2. THAT translation, we all know, was made at a time when the study of the original languages, which had been long neglected, was just revived in Europe. To this the invention of printing first, and the reformation soon afterwards, had greatly contributed. As it grew to be a received doctrine among Protestants, that the word of God, contained in the Scriptures, is the

sole infallible rule which he has given us of faith and manners; the ineffable importance of the study of Scripture was perceived more and more, every day. New translations were made, first into Latin, the common language of the learned, and afterwards into most European tongues. The study of languages naturally introduces the study of criticism, I mean that branch of criticism which has language for its object; and which is, in effect, no other than the utmost improvement of the grammatical art. But this, it must be acknowledged, was not then arrived at that perfection which, in consequence of the labours of many learned and ingenious men, of different parties and professions, it has reached since. What greatly retarded the progress of this study, in the first age of the reformation, was the incessant disputes about articles of doctrine, ecclesiastical polity, and ceremonies, in which the reformers were engaged, both with the Romanists, and among themselves. This led them insensibly to recur to the weapons which had been employed against them, and of which they had at first spoken very contemptuously, the metaphysical and unintelligible subtleties of school-divinity.

This recourse was productive of two bad consequences. First, it diverted them from the critical study of the sacred languages, the surest human means for discovering the mind of the Spirit: secondly, it infused into the heads of the disputants, prepossessions in favour of such particular words and phrases as are adapted to the dialect and system of the parties to which they severally

attached themselves ; and in prejudice of those words and phrases which seem more suitable to the style and sentiments of their adversaries. There is, perhaps, but too good reason for adding an evil consequence produced also upon the heart, in kindling wrath, and quenching charity. It was when matters were in this situation, that several of the first translations were made. Men's minds were then too much heated with their polemic exercises, to be capable of that impartial, candid, and dispassionate examination, which is so necessary in those who would approve themselves faithful interpreters of the oracles of God. Of an undue bias on the judgment in translating, in consequence of such perpetual wranglings, I have given some specimens in the former Dissertation⁶⁷.

§. 3. IN regard to the common translation, though not entirely exempted from the influence of party and example, as I formerly had occasion to show⁶⁸, it is, upon the whole, one of the best of those composed so soon after the Reformation. I may say justly that, if it had not been for an immoderate attachment, in its authors, to the Genevese translators, Junius, Tremellius, and Beza, it had been still better than it is ; for the greatest faults with which it is chargeable, are derived from this source. But since that time, it must be owned, things are greatly altered in the church. The rage of disputation on points

⁶⁷ Part V. § 4, &c.

⁶⁸ Diss. X. p. V. § 4, &c.

rather curious than edifying, or, as the Apostle calls it ⁶⁹, the dotage about questions and strifes of words, has, at least, among men of talents and erudition, in a great measure, subsided. The reign of scholastic sophistry and altercation is pretty well over. Now, when to this reflection we add a proper attention to the great acquisitions in literature which have of late been made, in respect, not only, of languages, but also, of antiquities and criticism, it cannot be thought derogatory from the merit and abilities of those worthy men who formerly bestowed their time and labour on that important work, to suppose that many mistakes, which were then inevitable, we are now in a condition to correct.

To effect this, is the first, and ought, doubtless, to be the principal, motive for attempting another version. Whatever is discovered to be the sense of the Spirit, speaking in the Scriptures, ought to be regarded by us, as of the greatest consequence: nor will any judicious person, who has not been accustomed to consider religion in a political light, as a mere engine of state, deny that where the truth appears, in any instance, to have been either misrepresented, or but obscurely represented, in a former version, the fault ought, in an attempt like the present, as far as possible, to be corrected. To say the contrary, is to make the honourable distinction of being instruments in promoting the knowledge of God, of less mo-

⁶⁹ 1 Tim. vi. 4.

ment, than paying a vain compliment to former translators, or, perhaps, showing an immoderate deference to popular humour, which is always attached to customary phrases, whether they convey the true meaning, or a false meaning, or any meaning at all. This, therefore, is unquestionably a good ground for varying from those who preceded us.

§ 4. It deserves further to be remarked that, from the changes incident to all languages, it sometimes happens that words, which expressed the true sense at the time when a translation was made, come afterwards to express a different sense; in consequence whereof, though those terms were once a proper version of the words in the original, they are not so after such an alteration, having acquired a meaning different from that which they had formerly. In this case, it cannot be doubted that, in a new translation, such terms ought to be changed. I hinted before⁷⁰, that I look upon this as having been the case with some of the expressions employed in the Vulgate. They conveyed the meaning at the time that version was made, but do not so now. I shall instance only in two. The phrase *pœnitentiam agite* was, in Jerom's time, nearly equivalent in signification to the Greek *μετανοειτε*. It is not so at present. In consequence of the usages which have crept in, and obtained an establishment in the churches subject to Rome, it no longer conveys the same

⁷⁰ Part III. § 9.

idea; for having become merely an ecclesiastic term, its acceptation is regulated only by ecclesiastic use. Now, in that use, it exactly corresponds to the English words *do penance*; by which, indeed, the Rhemish translators, who translate from the Vulgate, have rendered it in their New Testament. Now, as no person of common sense, who understands the language, will pretend, that to enjoin us to *do penance*, and to enjoin us to *reform* or *repent*, is to enjoin the same thing; both Erasmus and Beza were excusable, notwithstanding the censure pronounced by Bois and Simon, in deserting the Vulgate in this place, and employing the unambiguous term *resipiscite*, in preference to a phrase, now at least become so equivocal as *pœnitentiam agite*. We may warrantably say more, and affirm, that they would not have acted the part of faithful translators, if they had done otherwise.

It was, to appearance, the uniform object of the priest of the Oratory (I know not what may have biassed the canon of Ely) to put honour upon the church, by which he meant the church of Rome; to respect, above all things, and at all hazards, her dogmas, her usages, her ceremonies, her very words and phrases. The object of Christian interpreters is, above all things, and at all hazards, to convey, as perspicuously as they can, the truths of the Spirit. If the former ought to be the principal object of the translators of holy writ, Simon was undoubtedly in the right; if the latter, he was undoubtedly in the wrong. The other expression in the Vulgate, which may not improba-

bly have been proper at the time when that translation was made, though not at present, is *sacramentum* for *μυστηριον*, in the second scriptural sense which I observe to be sometimes given to the Greek word⁷¹. But, in consequence of the alterations which have since taken place in ecclesiastical use, the Latin term has acquired a meaning totally different, and is therefore now no suitable expression of the sense.

§ 5. Now, what has been observed of the Latin words above mentioned, has already happened to several words employed in the common English translation. Though this may appear, at first, extraordinary, as it is not yet two centuries since that version was made; it is, nevertheless, unquestionable. The number of changes whereby a living language is affected in particular periods, is not always in proportion to the extent of time. It depends on the stage of advancement, in which the language happens to be, during the period, more than on the length of the period. The English tongue, and the French too, if I mistake not, have undergone a much greater change than the Italian, in the last three hundred years; and perhaps as great as the Greek underwent, from the time of Homer to that of Plutarch, which was more than four times as long. It is not merely the number of writings in any language, but it is rather their merit and eminence, which confers stability on its words, phrases and idioms.

⁷¹ Diss. IX. Part I. § 7.

Certain it is that there is a considerable change in our own since the time mentioned; a change in respect of the construction as well as of the significations of the words. In some cases, we combine the words differently from the way in which they were combined at the time above referred to: we have acquired many words which were not used then, and many then in use are now either obsolete, or used in a different sense. These changes I shall here briefly exemplify. As habit is apt to mislead us, and we are little disposed to suspect that the meaning of a word or phrase, to which we are familiarised, was not always the meaning; to give some examples of such alteration, may prevent us from rashly accusing former translators, for improprieties where-with they are not chargeable; and to specify alterations on our own language, may serve to remove the doubts of those who imagine there is an improbability in what I have formerly maintained, concerning the variations which several words, in ancient languages, have undergone in different periods. Now, this is a point of so great moment to the literary critic and antiquary, that it is impossible thoroughly to understand, or accurately to interpret, ancient authors, without paying due regard to it. Through want of this regard, many things in ecclesiastic history have been much misunderstood, and grossly misrepresented. Unluckily, on this subject, powerful secular motives interfering, have seduced men to contribute to the general deception, and to explain ancient names by usages and opinions comparatively

modern. But this by the way; I proceed to the examples.

§ 6. I INTEND to consider, first, the instances affected by the last of the circumstances above mentioned, namely, those wherein the signification is changed, though the term itself remains. Of such I shall now produce some examples; first, in nouns. The word *conversation*, which means no more at present, than *familiar discourse* of two or more persons, did, at the time when the Bible was translated, denote *behaviour* in the largest acceptation. The Latin word *conversatio*, which is that generally used in the Vulgate, answering to the Greek *αναστροφη*, has commonly this meaning. But the English word has never, as far as I have observed, this acceptation, in the present use, except in the law phrase, *criminal conversation*. And I have reason to believe that, in the New Testament, it is universally mistaken by the unlearned, as signifying no more than familiar talk or discourse. Hence it has also happened, that hypocrites and fanatics have thought themselves authorised, by the words of Scripture, in placing almost the whole of practical religion in this alone. Yet, I do not remember that the word occurs, so much as once, in Scripture, in this sense. What we call *conversation* must, indeed, be considered as included, because it is a very important part of behaviour; but it is not to be understood as particularly specified. In one passage, it is expressly distinguished from familiar discourse or conversa-

tion, in the modern import of the word. *Τυπος γινου των πιστων εν λογω, εν αναστροφη*, rendered in the common version, “Be an example of the “believers *in word, in conversation* ⁷².” That these words *λογω* and *αναστροφη*, are not synonymous, the repeating of the preposition sufficiently shows. Though, therefore, not improperly rendered at that time, when the English term was used in a greater latitude of signification, they ought, manifestly, to be rendered now, *in conversation, in behaviour*; the first answering to *λογος*, the second to *αναστροφη*.

Another instance of such a variation we have in the word *thief*, which, in the language of Scripture, is confounded with *robber*, and probably was so also, in common language at that time, but is now invariably distinguished. They are always carefully distinguished in the original, the former being *κλεπτης*, the latter *ληστης*. The two criminals who were crucified with our Lord, are always called, by the two Evangelists, who specify their crime, *λησται* ⁷³, never *κλεπται*. Yet our translators have always rendered it *thieves*, never *robbers*. This is the more remarkable, as what we now call *theft*, was not a capital crime among the Jews. Yet the penitent malefactor confessed upon the cross, that he and his companion suffered *justly*, receiving *the due reward of their deeds* ⁷⁴. He probably would not have expressed himself in this manner, if their condemnation

⁷² 1 Tim. iv. 12.

⁷³ Matth. xxvii. 38. 44. Mark, xv. 27.

⁷⁴ Luke, xxiii. 41.

had not been warranted by the law of Moses. And though, doubtless, the English word, at that time, was used with greater latitude than it is at present; yet, as they had rendered the same original term *ληστης*, when applied to Barabbas, *robber*⁷⁵, they ought to have given the same interpretation of the word, as applied to the two malefactors, who, on the same occasion, were accused of the same crime. In like manner, in the parable of the compassionate Samaritan, the words rendered, *fell among thieves*⁷⁶, are, *λησταις περιεπεσεν*. Hardly would any person now confound the character there represented, with that of thieves.

Again, the expression, *the uppermost rooms*⁷⁷, does not suggest to men of this age, the idea of the chief places at table, but that of the apartments of the highest story. *The good man of the house*⁷⁸, though sufficiently intelligible, is become too homely (not to say ludicrous) a phrase for the master of the family. The word *lust*⁷⁹ is used, in the common translation, in an extent which it has not now; so also is *usury*⁸⁰. *Worship*⁸¹, for honour, or civil respect paid to men, does not suit the present idiom. The words *lewd* and *lewdness*⁸², in the New Testament,

⁷⁵ John, xviii. 40.

⁷⁶ Luke, x. 30.

⁷⁷ Matth. xxiii. 6.

⁷⁸ Matth. xx. 11.

⁷⁹ Rom. vii. 7.

⁸⁰ Matth. xxv. 27. Luke, xix. 23.

⁸¹ Luke, xiv. 10.

⁸² See an excellent illustration of the remark, in regard to these two words, in the Disquisitions concerning the Antiquities of the Christian Church, p. 4. note.

convey a meaning totally different from that in which they are now constantly used. The word *pitiful*, with us, never means, as it does in Scripture⁸³, in conformity to etymology, compassionate, merciful; but paltry, contèptible. In the following words, also, there is a deviation, though not so considerable, from the ancient import. *Meat*⁸⁴ and food are not now synonymous terms, neither are *cunning*⁸⁵ and skilful, *honest*⁸⁶ and decent, or becoming, *more*⁸⁷ and greater, *quick*⁸⁸ and living, *faithless*⁸⁹ and incredulous, *coasts*⁹⁰ and territories, or borders not confining with the sea.

The like variations have happened in verbs. *To prevent*⁹¹ is hardly ever now used, in prose, for to go before; *to faint*⁹², for to grow faint, to fail in strength; *to ensue*⁹³ for to pursue; *to provoke*⁹⁴, for to excite to what is proper and commendable; *to entreat*⁹⁵, for to treat; and *to learn*, for to teach⁹⁶. Even adverbs and particles have shared the general fate. *Yea* and *nay*⁹⁷, though still words in the language, are not the expressions of affirmation and negation as formerly; *instantly*⁹⁸ we never use for earnestly, nor *hitherto*⁹⁹ for

⁸³ James, v. 11.⁸⁴ Matth. iii. 4.⁸⁵ Exod. xxxviii. 23.⁸⁶ 2 Cor. viii. 21.⁸⁷ Acts, xix. 32.⁸⁸ Acts, x. 42.⁸⁹ John, xx. 27.⁹⁰ Matth. ii. 16.⁹¹ 1 Thess. iv. 15.⁹² Matth. xv. 32. Luke, xviii. 1.⁹³ 1 Pet. iii. 11.⁹⁴ Heb. x. 24.⁹⁵ Luke, xx. 11.⁹⁶ Psalm, xxv. 4. Common Prayer.⁹⁷ Matth. v. 37.⁹⁸ Luke, vii. 4.⁹⁹ Job, xxxviii. 11.

thus far. Yet this was, no doubt, its original meaning, and is more conformable to etymology than the present meaning; *hither* being an adverb of place and not of time. More instances might be given, if necessary.

Now, to employ words which, though still remaining in the language, have not the sanction of present use for the sense assigned to them, cannot fail to render the passages where they occur, almost always obscure, and sometimes ambiguous. But, as every thing which may either mislead the reader, or darken the meaning, ought carefully to be avoided by the interpreter, no example, however respectable, will, in such things, authorize our imitation. An alteration here implies nothing to the disadvantage of preceding translators, unless it can be supposed to detract from them, that they did not foresee the changes which, in after-times, would come upon the language. They employed the words according to the usage which prevailed in their time. The same reason, which made them adopt those words then, to wit, regard to perspicuity by conforming to present use, would, if they were now alive, and revising their own work, induce them to substitute others in their place.

§ 7. ANOTHER case in which a translator ought not implicitly to follow his predecessors, is in the use of words now become obsolete. There is little or no scope for this rule, when the subject is a version into a dead language like the Latin, which, except in the instances of some ecclesiastic

terms, such as those above taken notice of, is not liable to be affected by the changes to which a living tongue is continually exposed. The very notion of a dead language refers us to a period which is past, whose usages are now over, and may therefore be considered as unchangeable. But, in living languages, wherein use gradually varies, the greatest attention ought to be given to what obtains at present, on which both propriety and perspicuity must depend. Now, with respect to our common version, some words are disused only in a particular signification, others are become obsolete in every meaning. The former ought to be avoided, in such acceptations only as are not now favoured by use. The reason is obvious; because it is only in such cases that they suggest a false meaning. The latter ought to be avoided in every case wherein they do not clearly suggest the meaning. I admit that there are certain cases in which even an obsolete word may clearly suggest the meaning. For, first, the sense of an unusual or unknown word may be so ascertained by the words in connection, as to leave no doubt concerning its meaning; secondly, the frequent occurrence of some words in the common translation, and in the English liturgy, must hinder us from considering them, though not in common use, as unintelligible to persons acquainted with those books. The danger, therefore, from using words now obsolete, but frequently occurring in the English translation, is not near so great, as the danger arising from employing words not obsolete, in an obsolete mean-

ing, or a meaning which they formerly had, but have not at present. For these rarely fail to mislead.

Further, a distinction ought to be made in obsolete words, between those which, in Scripture, occur frequently, and whose meaning is generally known, and those which occur but rarely, and may, therefore, be more readily misunderstood. The use of old words, when generally understood, has, in such a book as the Bible, some advantages over newer terms, however apposite. A version of holy writ ought, no doubt, above all things, to be simple and perspicuous; but still it ought to appear, as it really is, the exhibition of a work of a remote age and distant country. When, therefore, the terms of a former version are, by reason of their frequent occurrence there, universally understood, though no longer current with us, either in conversation or in writing, I should account them preferable to familiar terms. Their antiquity renders them venerable. It adds even an air of credibility to the narrative, when we consider it as relating to the actions, customs, and opinions of a people very ancient, and, in all the respects now mentioned, very different from us. There may, therefore, be an excess in the familiarity of the style, though, whilst we are just to the original, there can be no excess in simplicity and perspicuity. It is for this reason, that I have retained sometimes, as emphatical, the interjections *lo!* and *behold!* which, though antiquated, are well understood; also that the obsolete word *host* is, in preference to *army*, employed in such

phrases as *the host of heaven, the Lord of hosts*; and that the terms *tribulation, damsel, publican*, and a few others, are considered as of more dignity than *trouble, girl, toll-gatherer*; and therefore worthy to be retained. For the like reason, the term of salutation *hail*, though now totally disused, except in poetry, has generally, in the sacred writings, a much better effect than any modern form which we could put in its place. To these we may add words which (though not properly obsolete) are hardly ever used, except when the subject, in some way or other, concerns religion. Of this kind are the words *sin, godly, righteous*, and some others, with their derivatives. Such terms, as they are neither obscure nor ambiguous, are entitled to be preferred to more familiar words. And if the plea for consecrated words extended no further, I should cheerfully subscribe to it. I cannot agree with Dr. Heylin, who declares explicitly¹⁰⁰ against the last mentioned term, though, by his own explanation, it, in many cases, conveys more exactly the sense of the original, than the word *just* which he prefers to it. The practice of translators into other languages, where they are confined by the genius of their language, is of no weight with us. The French have two words, *pouvoir* and *puissance*; the English word *power* answers to both. But, because we must make one term serve for both theirs, will they, in complaisance to us, think they are obliged to confine themselves to one? And, as to those over-deli-

¹⁰⁰ Theol. Lect. vol. i. p. 7.

cate ears, to which, he says, cant and fanaticism have tarnished and debased the words *righteous* and *righteousness*; were this consideration to influence us, in the choice of words, we should soon find that this would not be the only sacrifice it would be necessary to make. It is but too much the character of the age to nauseate whatever, in the intercourse of society, has any thing of a religious or moral appearance, a disposition which will never be satisfied, till every thing serious and devout be banished, not from the precincts of conversation only, but from the language.

But to return: when words totally unsupported by present use, occur in Scripture but rarely, they are accompanied with a degree of obscurity which renders them unfit for a book intended for the instruction of all men, the meanest not excepted. Of this class are the words *leasing*, for lies; *ravin*, for prey; *bruit*, for rumor; *marvel* for wonder; *worth* for be; *wot*, and *wist*, for know and knew; *to bewray*, for to expose; *to eschew*, for to avoid; *to skill*, for to be knowing in, or dexterous at; *to wax*, for to become; *to lease*, for to lose; and *to lack*, for to need or be wanting. Terms such as some of these, like old vessels, are, I may say, so buried in rust, as to render it difficult to discover their use. When words become not entirely obsolete, but fall into low or ludicrous use, it is then also proper to lay them aside. Thus *folk*, for people; *trow*, for think; *seethe*, for boil; *sod*, and *sodden*, for boiled; *score*, for twenty; *twain*, for

two; *clean* and *sore*, when used adverbially, for entirely and very much; *all to*, *allbeit*, and *howbeit*, may easily be given up. To these we may add the words that differ so little from those which have still a currency, that it would appear like affectation to prefer them to terms equally proper and more obvious. Of this kind are *mo*, for more; *strait* and *straitly*, for strict and strictly; *aliant*, for alien; *dureth*, for endureth; *camp*, for encamp; *minish*, for diminish; *an hungred*, for hungry; *garner*, for granary; *trump*, for trumpet; *sith*, for since; *fet*, for fetched; *ensample*, for example; *mids*, for midst. I shall only add, that when old words are of low origin, harsh sound, or difficult pronounciation; or when they appear too much like learned words; familiar terms, if equally apposite, are more eligible. For this reason, the nouns *backslidings*, *shamefacedness*, *jeopardy*, and *concupiscence*, may well be dispensed with.

Upon the whole, there is still some danger in retaining words which are become obsolete, though they continue to be intelligible. Words hardly sooner contract the appearance of antiquity, by being abandoned by good use, than they are picked up as lawful prize by writers in burlesque, who, by means of them, often add much poignancy to their writings. This prostitution, when frequent, produces an association in the minds of readers, the reverse of that which originally accompanied them. Hence it is that, though nothing is better suited to the seriousness and importance of the subject of holy writ, than solemnity of

style; nothing is, at the same time, more hazardous, as no species of diction borders on the ludicrous oftener, than the solemn. Let it suffice, therefore, if, without venturing far from the style of conversation, in quest of a more dignified elocution, we can unite gravity with simplicity and purity, which commonly secure perspicuity. With these qualities there can be no material defect in the expression. The sprightly, the animated, the nervous, would not, in such a work, be beauties, but blemishes. They would look too much like meretricious ornaments, when compared with the artless, the free, yet unassuming, manner of the sacred writers.

§ 3. BUT, if it be of consequence to avoid antiquated words, it is not less so to avoid antiquated phrases, and an antiquated construction. No writing in our language, as far as I know, is less chargeable with idiomatical phrases, vulgarisms, or any peculiarities of expression, than the common translation of the Bible; and to this it is, in a great measure, imputable, that the diction remains still so perspicuous, and that it is universally accounted superior to that of any other English book of the same period. But, though remarkably pure, in respect of style, we cannot suppose that no idiomatical phrases should have escaped the translators, especially when we consider the frequency of such phrases in the writings of their contemporaries. Yet, in all the four Gospels, I recollect only two or three which come under that denomination. These are, *The good*

man of the house, They laughed him to scorn, and They cast the same in his teeth; expressions for which the interpreters had not the apology that may be pleaded in defence of some idioms in the Old Testament history, that they are literal translations from the original¹⁰¹. That the English construction has undergone several alterations since the establishment of the Protestant religion in England, it would be easy to evince. Some verbs often then used impersonally, and some reciprocally, are hardly ever so used at present. *It pitieth them*¹⁰², would never be said now. *It repented him*¹⁰³, may possibly be found in modern language, but never *he repented himself*¹⁰⁴. There is a difference also in the use of the prepositions. *In*¹⁰⁵ was then sometimes used for *upon*, and *unto* instead of *for*¹⁰⁶. *Of* was frequently used before the cause or the instrument, where we now invariably use *by*¹⁰⁷; *of* was also employed, in certain cases, where present use requires *off* or *from*¹⁰⁸. Like differences might be observed in the pronouns. One thing is certain, that the old usages in construction, oftener occasioned ambiguity than the present, which is an additional reason for preferring the latter.

¹⁰¹ Matth. xx. 11. *οικοδεσποτου*. ix. 24. *κατεγελων αυτου*.
xxvii. 44. *Το αυτο ωνειδιξον αυτω*.

¹⁰² Psal. cii. 14. Common Prayer.

¹⁰³ Genesis, vi. 6.

¹⁰⁴ Matth. xxvii. 3.

¹⁰⁵ Matth. vi. 10.

¹⁰⁶ John, xv. 7.

¹⁰⁷ Matth. i. 18.

¹⁰⁸ Matth. vii. 16.

§ 9. FINALLY, in regard to what may be called *technical*, or, in Simon's phrase, *consecrated* terms, our translators, though not entirely free from such, have been comparatively sparing of them. In this they have acted judiciously. A technical style is a learned style. That of the Scriptures, especially of the historical part, is the reverse; it is plain and familiar. If we except a few terms, such as *angel*, *apostle*, *baptism*, *heresy*, *mystery*, which, after the example of other Western churches, the English have adopted from the Vulgate; and for adopting some of which, as has been observed, good reasons might be offered; the instances are but few wherein the common name has been rejected, in preference to a learned and peculiar term.

Nay, some learned terms, which have been admitted into the liturgy, at least into the rubric, the interpreters have not thought proper to introduce into the Scriptures. Thus, the words, *the nativity*, for Christ's birth, *advent*, for his coming, *epiphany*, for his manifestation to the Magians by the star, do very well in the titles of the several divisions in the Book of Common Prayer, being there a sort of proper names for denoting the whole circumstantiated event, or rather the times destined for the celebration of the festivals, and are convenient, as they save circumlocution; but would by no means suit the simple and familiar phraseology of the sacred historians, who never affect uncommon, and especially learned words. Thus, in the titles of the books of Moses, the Greek names of the Septuagint, *Genesis*, *Exo-*

odus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, are not unfitly preserved in modern translations, and are become the proper names of the books. But where the Greek word *genesis*, which signifies generation, occurs in that ancient version of the book so named, it would have been very improper to transfer it into a modern translation, and to say, for example, "This is the *genesis* of the "heavens and the earth¹⁰⁹." In like manner, *Exodus*, which signifies departure, answers very well as a proper name of the second book, which begins with an account of the departure of the Israelites out of Egypt; but it would be downright pedantry to introduce the term *exodus, exody, or exod* (for in all these shapes some have affected to usher it into the language,) into the body of the history.

I remember but one passage in the New Testament, in which our translators have preferred a scholastic to the vulgar name, where both signified the same thing; so that there was no plea from necessity. The expression alluded to is, "To whom he showed himself alive after his *passion*¹¹⁰." *Passion*, in ordinary speech, means solely a fit of anger, or any violent commotion of the mind. It is only in theological or learned use that it means the sufferings of Christ. The Evangelist wrote to the people in their own dialect. Besides, as he wrote for the conviction of infidels, as well as for the instruction of believers, it is not natural to suppose that he would use words or

¹⁰⁹ Gen. ii. 4.

¹¹⁰ Acts, i. 3.

phrases, in a particular acceptation, which could be known only to the latter. His expression, *μετα το παθειν αυτον*, which is literally, *after his sufferings*, is plain and unambiguous, and might have been said of any man who had undergone the like fate. Such is constantly the way of the sacred writers; nor is any thing, in language, more repugnant to their manner, than the use of what is called consecrated words. I admit, at the same time, that *post passionem suam*, in the Vulgate, is unexceptionable, because it suits the common acceptation of the word *passio* in the Latin language. Just so, the expression *accipiens calicem*, in the Vulgate¹¹¹, is natural and proper. *Calix* is a common name for cup, and is so used in several places of that version: whereas, *taking the chalice*, as the Rhemish translators render it, presents us with a technical term not strictly proper, inasmuch as it suggests the previous consecration of the vessel to a special purpose, by certain ceremonies, an idea not suggested by either the Greek *ποτηριον*, or the Latin *calix*. I do not mean, however, to controvert the propriety of adopting an unfamiliar word, when necessary for expressing what is of an unfamiliar, or, perhaps, singular nature. Thus, to denote the change produced on our Saviour's body, when on the mount with the three disciples, Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, a more apposite word than *transfigured* could not have been found. The English word *transformed*, which comes nearest,

¹¹¹ Matth. xxvi. 27.

and is more familiar than the other, would have expressed too much.

§ 10. To conclude, the reasons which appear sufficient to justify a change of the words and expressions of even the most respectable predecessors in the business of translating, are, when there is ground to think, that the meaning of the author can be either more exactly, or more perspicuously, rendered; and when his manner, that is, when the essential qualities of his style, not the sound or the etymology of his words, can be more adequately represented. For, to one or other of these, all the above cases will be found reducible.

$$\sqrt{\frac{54}{33}}$$

Dissertation the Twelfth.

An Account of what is attempted in the Translation of the Gospels, and in the Notes here offered to the Public.

THE things which will be treated in this Dissertation may, for the sake of order, be classed under the five following heads ; the first comprehends all that concerns the essential qualities of the version ; the second, what relates to the readings (where there is a diversity of reading in the original) which are here preferred ; the third contains a few remarks on the particular dialect of our language employed in this version ; the fourth, what regards the outward form in which it is exhibited ; and the fifth, some account of the notes with which it is accompanied.

PART I.

THE ESSENTIAL QUALITIES OF THE VERSION.

THE three principal objects to be attended to, by every translator, were explained in a former Dissertation¹. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to say,

¹ Diss. X. Part I.

that to them I have endeavoured to give a constant attention. It is not, however, to be dissembled, that even those principal objects themselves sometimes interfere. And, though an order, in respect of importance, when they are compared together, has been also laid down, which will, in many cases, determine the preference ; it will not always determine it. I may find a word, for example, which hits the sense of the author precisely, but which, not being in familiar use, is obscure. Though, therefore, in itself, a just expression of the sentiment, it may not clearly convey the sentiment to many readers, because they are unacquainted with it. It is, therefore, but ill fitted to represent the plain and familiar manner of the sacred writers, or, indeed, to answer the great end of translation, to convey distinctly, to the reader, the meaning of the original. Yet there may be a hazard, on the other hand, that a term more perspicuous, but less apposite, may convey somewhat of a different meaning, an error more to be avoided than the other. Recourse to circumlocution is sometimes necessary ; for the terms of no two languages can be always made to correspond ; but frequent recourse to this mode of rendering, effaces the native simplicity found in the original, and, in some measure, disfigures the work. Though, therefore, in general, an obscure, is preferable to an unfaithful, translation, there is a degree of precision, in the correspondence of the terms, which an interpreter ought to dispense with, rather than involve his version in such darkness, as will render it useless to the generality of

readers. This shows sufficiently, that no rule will universally answer the translator's purpose ; but that he must often carefully balance the degrees of perspicuity on one hand, against those of precision on the other, and determine, from the circumstances of the case, concerning their comparative importance. I acknowledge that, in several instances, the counterpoise may be so equal, that the most judicious interpreters may be divided in opinion ; nay, the same interpreter may hesitate long in forming a decision, or even account it a matter of indifference to which side he inclines.

§ 2. I SHALL only say, in general, that, however much a word may be adapted to express the sense, it is a strong objection against the use of it, that it is too fine a word, too learned, or too modern. For, though in the import of the term, there should be a suitableness to the principal idea intended to be conveyed, there is an unsuitableness in the associated or secondary ideas, which never fail to accompany such terms. These tend to fix on the Evangelists the imputation of affecting elegance, depth in literature or science, or, at least, a modish and flowery phraseology, than which nothing can be more repugnant to the genuine character of their style, a style eminently natural, simple, and familiar. The sentiment of *Jaques le Fevre d'Estaples*², which shows,

² An old French commentator, who published a version of the Gospels into Latin in 1523 ; his words are : “ Ce que plusieurs estiment elegance, est inelegance et parole fardée devant Dieu.”

at once, his good taste and knowledge of the subject, is here entirely apposite: "What many think elegance is, in God's account, inelegance, and painted words."

§ 3. ON the other hand, a bad effect is also produced by words, which are too low and vulgar. The danger here is not, indeed, so great, provided there be nothing ludicrous in the expression, which is sometimes the case with terms of this denomination. When things themselves are of a kind which gives few occasions of introducing the mention of them into the conversation of the higher ranks, and still fewer of naming them in books, their names are considered as partaking in the meanness of the use, and of the things signified. But this sort of vulgarity seems not to have been regarded by the inspired authors. When there was a just occasion to speak of the thing, they appear never to have been ashamed to employ the name by which it was commonly distinguished. They did not recur, as modern delicacy prompts us to do, to periphrasis, unusual, or figurative expressions, but always adopted such terms as most readily suggested themselves. There is nothing more indelicate, than an unseasonable display of delicacy; for which reason, the naked simplicity wherewith the sacred penmen express themselves on particular subjects, has much more modesty in it than the artificial, but transparent, disguises

which, on like occasions, would be employed by modern writers³.

A certain correctness of taste, as well as acuteness of discernment, taught a late ingenious author⁴ to remark this wonderful union of plainness and chastity in the language of the Bible, which a composer of these days, in any European tongue, would in vain attempt to imitate. Yet, it is manifest, that it is not to justness of taste, but to purity of mind in the sacred authors, that this happy singularity in their writings ought to be ascribed. This, however, is an evidence that they did not

³ I can scarcely give a better illustration of this remark than in the correction proposed by Dr. Delany, of the phrase *him that pisseth against the wall*, which occurs sometimes in the Old Testament, and which, he thinks, should be changed into *him that watéreth against the wall*. I am surprised that a correction like this should have the approbation of so excellent a writer as the bishop of Waterford. (See the preface to his Version of the Minor Prophets.) To me the latter expression is much more exceptionable than the former. The former may be compared to the simplicity of a savage who goes naked without appearing to know it, or ever thinking of clothes; the other is like the awkward and unsuccessful attempt of an European, to hide the nakedness of which, by the very attempt, he shews himself to be both conscious and ashamed. The same offensive idea is suggested by the word which Delany proposes, as is conveyed by the common term; but it is suggested in so affected a manner, as necessarily fixes a reader's attention upon it, and shows it to have been particularly thought of by the writer. Can any critic seriously think that more is necessary, in this case, than to say, *Every male?*

⁴ Rousseau.

consider it as mean or unbecoming, to call low or common things by their common names. But there are other sorts of vulgarisms in language, with which they are never chargeable, the use of such terms as we call cant words, which belong peculiarly to particular professions, or classes of men, and contemptuous or ludicrous expressions, such as are always accompanied with ideas of low mirth and ridicule.

§ 4. OF both the extremes in language above mentioned, I shall give examples from an anonymous English translator in 1729, whose version, upon the whole, is the most exceptionable of all I am acquainted with, in any language; and yet it is but doing justice to the author to add that, in rendering some passages, he has been more fortunate than much better translators. For brevity's sake, I shall here only mention the words I think censurable, referring to the margin for the places. Of learned words the following are a specimen: *verbose*⁵, *loquaciousness*⁶, *advent*⁷, *chasm*⁸, *grumes*⁹, *steril*¹⁰, *phenomena*¹¹, *consolated*¹², *investigate*¹³, *innate*¹⁴, *saliva*¹⁵; concerning which, and some others of the same kind, his critical examiner, Mr. Twell, says justly, that they are unintelligible to the ignorant, and offensive to the knowing. His

⁵ Matth. vi. 7.⁶ Ibid.⁷ xxiv. 27.⁸ Luke, xvi. 26.⁹ xxii. 44.¹⁰ i. 17.¹¹ xii. 56.¹² Acts, xv. 32.¹³ xvii. 22.¹⁴ Eph. iv. 18.¹⁵ John, ix. 6.

fine words and fashionable phrases, which, on account of their affinity, I shall throw together, the following may serve to exemplify: *detachment*¹⁶, *foot-guards*¹⁷, *brigue*¹⁸, *chicanery*¹⁹. *Zacharias*, we are told²⁰, *vented his divine enthusiasm*; that is, when translated into common speech, *propheied*. A later translator, or rather paraphrast, is not much happier in his expression, *he was seized with a divine afflatus*, here spoken of as a disease. *Zaccheus*, for chief of the publicans, is made *collector-general of the customs*²¹. *Simon Magus*, in his hands, becomes *the plenipotentiary of God*²². Jesus Christ is titled *guarantee of the alliance*²³, and the Lord of hosts, *the Lord of the celestial militia*²⁴. And, to avoid the flatness of plain prose, he sometimes gives a poetical turn to the expression. *Before the cock crow*, becomes in his hands, *Before the cock proclaims the day*²⁵.

The foppery of these last expressions is, if possible, more insufferable than the pedantry of the first. They are, besides, so far from conveying the sense of the author, that they all, less or more, misrepresent it. As to low and ludicrous terms, there is sometimes a greater coincidence in these with quaint and modish words, than one at first would imagine. It would not be easy to assign a motive for rendering *οικοδεσποτης yeoman*²⁶, but it

¹⁶ Matth. ii. 16.¹⁷ xxvii. 27.¹⁸ 1 Thess. v. 13.¹⁹ 1 Tim. vi. 4.²⁰ Luke, i. 67.²¹ xix. 2.²² Acts, viii. 10.²³ Heb. vii. 22.²⁴ James, v. 4.²⁵ Luke, xxii. 34.²⁶ Matth. xiii. 27.

is still worse to translate ὅσοι την θαλασσαν εργαζονται *supercargoes*²⁷, ἀρπαξιν *rapparees*²⁸, which he explains in the margin to mean *kidnappers*, and μεθυστων *sots*²⁹. I am surprised he has not found a place for *sharpers*, *gamblers*, and *swindlers*, fit company, in every sense, for his *sots* and *rapparees*. Γλωσσοκομον is distended into a *bank*³⁰, and κλεπτης dwindles into a *pilferer*³¹: την χαραν του κυριου σου is degraded into *thy master's diversions*³², and αινος is swoln into a *consort of praise*³³. The laudable and successful importunity of the two blind men who, notwithstanding the checks they received from the multitude, persisted in their application to Jesus for relief, is contemptuously denoted *bawling out*³⁴. When we are told that our Lord *silenced*; ἐφιμωσε, the *Sadducees*, this author acquaints us that he *dumbfounded them*³⁵. In short, what by magnifying, what by diminishing, what by distorting and disfiguring; he has, in many places, burlesqued the original. For answering this bad purpose, the extremes of cant and bombast are equally well adapted. The excess, in the instances now given, is so manifest, as entirely to supersede both argument and illustration.

§ 5. BUT, in regard to the use of what may be called learned words, it must be owned, after all;

²⁷ Rev. xviii. 17.

²⁸ 1 Cor. v. 10.

²⁹ Matth. xxiv. 49.

³⁰ John, xii. 6.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Matth. xxv. 21.

³³ xxi. 16.

³⁴ xx. 31.

³⁵ xxii. 34.

that it is not easy, in every case, to fix the boundaries. We sometimes find classed under that denomination, all the words of Greek and Latin etymology, which are not current among the inferior orders of the people. Yet I acknowledge that, if we were rigidly to exclude all such terms, we should be too often obliged, either to adopt circumlocution, or to express the sentiment weakly and improperly. There are other disadvantages, to be remarked afterwards, which might result from the exclusion of every term that may be comprehended in the definition above given. The common translation, if we except the consecrated terms, as some call them, which are not many, is universally admitted to be written in a style that is not only natural, but easily understood by the people: yet, in the common translation, there are many words which can hardly be supposed ever to have been quite familiar among the lower ranks. There is, however, one advantage possessed by that version, over every other book composed at that period, which is, that from the universality of its use, and (we may now add) its long continuance, it must have greatly contributed to give a currency to those words which are frequently employed in it. Now, it would be absurd, in an interpreter of this age, to expect a similar effect from any private version. A new translation, even though it were authorized by the public, would not have the same advantage at present, when our language is in a more advanced stage.

§ 6. I SHOULD not be surprized, that a reader not accustomed narrowly to attend to these matters, were disposed, at first hearing, to question the fact, that there are many words in the vulgar translation which were not in common use at the time among the lower orders. But I am persuaded that a little reflection must soon convince him of it. Abstracted from those terms which have been transferred from the original languages, because there were no corresponding names in our tongue, such as *phylactery*, *tetrarch*, *synagogue*, *proselyte*, *centurion*, *quaternion*, *legion*, there are many in the English Bible, which cannot be considered as having been, at that time, level to the meanest capacities. They are scarcely so yet, notwithstanding all the advantage which their occurring in that translation has given them. Of such words I shall give a pretty large specimen in the margin³⁶. Nor can it be said of those

³⁶ *First, of nouns*: scribe, disciple, parable, epistle, infidel, matrix, lunatic, exile, exorcist, suppliant, residue, genealogy, appetite, audience, pollution, perdition, partition, potentate, progenitor, liberality, occurrent, immutability, pre-eminence, remission, diversity, fragment, abjects, frontier, tradition, importunity, concupiscence, redemption, intercession, superscription, inquisition, insurrection, communion, instructor, mediator, exactor, intercessor, benefactor, malefactor, prognosticator, ambassador, ambassage, ambushment, meditation, ministration, administration, abomination, consummation, convocation, constellation, consolation, consultation, acceptation, communication, disputation, cogitation, estimation, operation, divination, vocation, desolation, tribulation, regeneration, propitiation, jus-

there specified, that more familiar terms could not have been found equally expressive. For, though this may be true of some of them, it is not true of them all. *Calling* is equivalent to vocation, *comfort* to consolation, *destruction* to perdition, *forgiveness* to remission, *defilement* to pollution, *almighty* to omnipotent, *enlightened* to illuminated, *watchful* to vigilant, *delightful* to delectable, *unchangeable* to immutable, *heavenly* to celestial, and *earthly* to terrestrial. Nay, the first six in the marginal list might have been not badly supplied by the more homely terms, *writer*, *scholar*, *comparison*, *letter*, *unbeliever*, *womb*. Yet, I would not be understood, by this remark, as intending to throw any blame upon the translators, for the choice they have sometimes made of words which, though not obscure, were not the most familiar that it was possible to find. There are several reasons, to be given immediately, which may justly determine the translator, on some occasions, to desert the common rule of adopting always the most obvious words. At the same time there

tification, sanctification, salutation, interpretation, supplication, exaction, unction. *Second, of adjectives*: barbed, circumspect, conversant, extinct, vigilant, inordinate, delectable, tributary, impotent, magnificent, immutable, innumerable, celestial, incorruptible, terrestrial, omnipotent. *Third, of verbs and participles*: laud, distil, remit, adjure, implead, estimate, ascend, descend, frustrate, disannul, reverse, meditate, premeditate, predestinate, consort, amerce, transferred, transfigured, illuminated, consecrated, translated, incensed, mollified.

are certain excesses in this way, whereof I have also given examples, into which a judicious interpreter will never be in danger of falling. The reasons which ought, on the other hand, to determine a translator, not to confine himself to the words which are current in the familiar tattle of the lower ranks in society, are as follows :

§ 7. FIRST, in all compositions not in the form of dialogue, even the simplest, there is some superiority, in the style, to the language of conversation, among the common people ; and even the common people themselves understand many words, which, far from having any currency among them, never enter into their ordinary talk. This is particularly the case with those of them who have had any sort of education, were it but the lowest. One ought, therefore, to consider accurately the degree of the uncommonness of the term, before it be rejected : as it may not be easy to supply its place with one more familiar, and equally apposite. Unnecessary circumlocutions are cumbersome, and ought always to be avoided. They are unfriendly alike to simplicity and to energy, and sometimes even to propriety and perspicuity.

§ 8. SECONDLY, there are cases wherein some things may be done, nay, ought to be done, by a translator, for the sake of variety. I acknowledge that this is a subordinate consideration, and that variety is never to be purchased at the expense of

either perspicuity, or simplicity. But even the sacred historians, though eminently simple and perspicuous, do not always confine themselves to the same words in expressing the same thoughts. Not that there appears in their manner any aim at varying the expression ; but, it is well known that, without such an aim, the same subject, even in conversation, is hardly ever twice spoken of precisely in the same words. To a certain degree this is a consequence of that quality I have had occasion oftener than once to observe in them, a freedom from all solicitude about their language. Whereas an unvarying recourse to the same words for expressing the same thoughts, would, in fact, require one to be solicitous about uniformity, and uncommonly attentive to it. But in the use of the terms of principal consequence, in which the association between the words and the ideas is much stronger, they are pretty uniform in recurring to the same words, though they are not so in matters of little moment. Yet in these the variety is no greater than is perfectly natural in men whose thoughts are engrossed by their subject, and who never search about in quest of words. Now it is only in consequence of some attention to language in a translator, that he is capable of doing justice to this inattention, if I may so denominate it, of his author.

§ 9. THIRDLY, it was remarked before³⁷, that though there is a sameness of idiom in the writers

³⁷ Diss. I. Part II.

of the New Testament, particularly the Evangelists, there is a diversity in their styles. Hence it arises, that different terms are sometimes employed, by the different historians, in relating the same fact. But, as this circumstance has not much engaged the attention of interpreters, it often happens that, in the translations of the Gospels, (for this is not peculiar to any one translation,) there appears in the version, a greater coincidence in the style of the Evangelists, than is found in the original. Now there are very good reasons to determine us to avoid, as much as possible, a sameness which is not authorized by the original. There are cases, I own, in which it is unavoidable. It often happens that two or more words, in the language of the author, are synonymous, and may therefore be used indiscriminately, for expressing the same thing, when it is impossible to find more than one, in the language of the translator, which can be used with propriety. When our Lord fed the five thousand men in the desert, the order he gave to the people immediately before, was, as expressed by Matthew³⁸, *ανακλιθηναι επι τους χορτους*; as expressed by Mark³⁹, *ανακλιναι επι τω γλωρω χορτω*; as expressed by Luke⁴⁰, *κατακλινατε αυτους*; and, as expressed by John⁴¹, *ποιησατε αναπεσειν*. Here every one of the Evangelists conveys the same order in a different phrase, all of them, however, both natu-

³⁸ Matth. xiv. 19.

⁴⁰ Luke, ix. 14.

³⁹ Mark, vi. 39.

⁴¹ John, vi. 10.

rally and simply. This variety it would be impossible to imitate in English, without recurring to unnatural and affected expressions. The three last Evangelists use different verbs to express the posture, namely *ανακλινω*, *κατακλινω*, and *αναπιπτω*. And even in the first, the expression is, I may say, equally varied, as one of the two who use that verb, employs the passive voice, the other the active. Now, in the common translation, the phrase *to sit down*, signifying the posture, is the same in them all. I do not here animadvert on the impropriety of this version. I took occasion formerly⁴², to observe that those Greek words denote always *to lie*, and not *to sit*. My intention at present is only to show that the simplicity of the sacred writers does not entirely exclude variety. Even the three terms above mentioned, are not all that occur in the Gospels for expressing the posture then used at table. *Ανακειμαι*, and *κατακειμαι*, are also employed. It would be in vain to attempt, in modern tongues, which are comparatively scanty, to equal the copiousness of Greek ; but, as far as the language which we use will permit, we ought not to overlook even these little variations.

§ 10. THE Evangelists have been thought, by many, so much to coincide in their narratives, as to give scope for suspecting that some of those, who wrote more lately, copied those who wrote before them. Though it must be owned that there

⁴² Diss. VIII. Part III. § 3, &c.

is often a coincidence, both in matter and in expression, it will not be found so great in the original, nor so frequent as, perhaps, in all translations ancient and modern. Many translators have considered it as a matter of no moment, provided the sense be justly rendered, whether the differences in the manner were attended to or not. Nay, in certain cases, wherein it would have been easy to attain, in the version, all the variety of the original, some interpreters seem studiously to have avoided it. Perhaps they did not judge it convenient to make the appearance of a difference between the sacred writers in words, when there was none in meaning. In this, however, I think they judged wrong. An agreement in the sense, is all that ought to be desired in them; more especially, as they wrote in a language different from that spoken by the persons whose history they relate. When this is the case, the most tenacious memory will not account for a perfect identity of expression in the witnesses. Their testimony is given in Greek. The language spoken by those whose story they relate, was a dialect of Chaldee. They were themselves, therefore (at least three of them,) the translators of the speeches and conversations recorded in their histories. The utmost that is expected from different translators, is a coincidence in sense; a perfect coincidence in words, in a work of such extent as the Gospel, is, without previous concert, impossible. Consequently, an appearance of difference, arising solely from the use of different expressions, is of much less prejudice to the

credibility of their narration, than the appearance of concert or copying would have been.

When, therefore, the language of the interpreter of the Gospels will admit an imitation of such diversities in the style, it ought not to be overlooked. If possible, their narratives should be neither more, nor less, coincident, in the version, than they are, in the original. And to this end, namely, that the phraseology may nearly differ as much in English as it does in Greek, I have, on some occasions, chosen not the very best word which might have been found, satisfying myself with this, that there is nothing in the word I have employed, unsuitable, dark, or ambiguous. But, as was signified before, it is not possible so to diversify the style of a version, as to make it always correspond, in this respect, to the original. Nor ought a correspondence of this kind ever to be attempted, at the expense of either perspicuity or propriety. I shall only add, that a little elevation of style may naturally be expected in quotations from the Prophets and the Psalms, and in the short canticles which we have in the two first chapters of Luke; for in these, though not written in verse, the expression is poetical.

§ 11. FOURTHLY, Not only the differences in the styles of the different Evangelists, ought not to pass entirely unnoticed; but the same thing may be affirmed of the changes sometimes found in the terms used by the same Evangelist. Here, again, I must observe, that it were in vain to attempt an

exact correspondence in this respect. There is a superior richness in the language of the sacred writers which even their style, though simple and unaffected (for they never step out of their way in quest of ornament,) cannot entirely conceal. They use considerable variety of terms for expressing those ordinary exertions for which our modern tongues hardly admit any variety. I have given one specimen of this, in the words whereby they express the posture then used at meals. I shall here add some other examples. The following words occur in the New Testament, *λεγω, επω, φημι, φασκω, φραζω, ρεω, ειρω, ερεω*, all answering to the English verb *say*. Of these we may affirm, with truth, that it is but rarely that any of them admits a different rendering in our language. The words *κοινοω, μολυνω, μαινω, σπιλω, ρυπω*, correspond to the English verb *defile*, by which they are commonly rendered. So also do the words *βρωσκω, εσθιω, τρωγω, φαγω*, to the English verb *eat*. The greater part of the words subjoined are, in the common translation, rendered always, and the rest occasionally, by the English verb *see*; *ειδω, απειδω, οπτομαι, οπιανω, βλεπω, εμβλεπω, οραω, καθοραω, θεαομαι, θεωρεω, ιστορεω*. Yet, in none of the lists aforementioned, are the words perfectly synonymous, nor can they be said to be always used promiscuously by the inspired penmen. They are, consequently, of use, not only for diversifying the style, but for giving it also a degree of precision which poorer languages cannot supply.

The same thing may be exemplified in the nouns, though not, perhaps, in the same degree as in the verbs. *ἄρς*, *ἀρνιον*, *ἀμνος*, are used by the Evangelists, the first by Luke, the other two by John; and are all rendered, in the common translation, *lamb*: *δικτυον*, *ἀμφιβληστρον*, *σαγηνη*, in the Gospels, are all translated *net*. And, though the latter might have been varied in the version, the others could not with propriety. Sometimes we are obliged to render different words which occur pretty often, but are not entirely synonymous, by the same English word, for want of distinct terms adapted to each meaning. Thus, the words *παιδια* and *τεκνα* are, if I mistake not, uniformly rendered *children*; though the former word particularly respects the age and size, the latter solely the relation. The first answers to the Latin *pueruli*, the second to *liberi*. The English word *children* is well adapted to the former, though sometimes but awkwardly employed to denote the latter. Yet, for want of another term to express the offspring, without limiting it to either sex, we find it necessary to use the English word in this application. The word *ὁ πλησιον*, used by the Evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, *γειτων* by Luke and John, and *περιουικος* only by Luke, are all rendered *neighbour*. And though they are evidently not of the same signification, it would be difficult, in our language, to express the sense of any of them in one word, which would answer so well as this. Yet, that they are not synonymous, every one who understands Greek must, on reflection, be sensible. For if, instead of *πλησιον*, in the commandment,

Αγαπήσεις τον πλησιον σου ὡς σεαυτον, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, we should substitute either *γειτονα*, or *περιοικον*, we should totally alter the precept; for these terms would comprehend none but those who live within what is strictly called the neighbourhood. The translation, indeed, into English ought to be the same; and, to say the truth, it would be a more exact version of that precept, than it is of the precept, as we actually find it in the Gospel. For, let it be observed, that the word *neighbour* is one of those which, for want of more apposite terms, we are obliged to admit, in Scripture, in a meaning not perfectly warranted by common use.

I shall add but one other example. The word *φιλος*, used by Matthew, Luke, and John, and *ἑταιρος*, used only by Matthew, are both rendered *friend*; yet, in their genuine signification, there is but little affinity between them. The former always implies affection and regard, the latter does not. The latter, not the former, was employed as a civil compellation to strangers and indifferent persons. It is that which is given, in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard⁴³, to the envious and dissatisfied labourer; in the parable of the marriage feast⁴⁴ to the guest who had not the wedding garment; and it was given by our Lord to the traitor Judas⁴⁵, when he came to deliver him up to his enemies. I do not say that *ἑταιρος* is not rightly translated *friend* in these instances; for common use permits us to employ the word

⁴³ Matth. xx. 13.⁴⁴ xxii. 12.⁴⁵ xxvi. 50.

in this latitude. But it is to be regretted, that we have not a word better adapted to such cases, but are obliged to prostitute a name so respectable as that of *friend*. Besides, it is manifest that, for this prostitution, we cannot plead the example of the Evangelists. I make this remark the more willingly, as I have heard some unlearned readers express their surprize that our Lord should have paid so much deference to the insincere modes of civility established by the corrupt customs of the world, as to denominate a man *friend*, whom he knew to harbour the basest and the most hostile intentions. But defects of this kind are not peculiar to our language: They are, on the contrary, to be found in every tongue. All the Latin translations render the word, in the passages above mentioned, *amico*: and all the versions into modern tongues, with which I am acquainted, except one, act in the same manner. The exception meant is the Geneva French, which says not *mon ami*, as others, but *compagnon*, in all the three places mentioned. This is more literal, for *ἑταῖρος* is, strictly, *socius*, or *sodalis*, not *amicus*. But it may be questioned, whether such a compellation suits the idiom of that tongue, as it appears to have been adopted by no other French interpreter.

§ 12. I SHALL NOW give, from the first of the list of verbs above mentioned, an instance or two of the uniformity commonly observed in the use of this variety, a uniformity which sufficiently

evinces, that the terms were not conceived by the writers to be perfectly synonymous. Our Lord says, in his sermon on the mount⁴⁶, *Ηκουσατε ὅτι ΕΡΡΕΘΗ τοις αρχαιοις· Ου φονευσεις—Εγω δε ΑΕΓΩ ὑμιν, ὅτι—ὅς αν ΕΙΠΗ τω αδελφω αυτου, Ρακα* :—In the common translation, *You have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill—But I say unto you, that—whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca*—In the English, the verb *say* occurs thrice in this short passage ; in the Greek, there are three different verbs employed. Yet so little does there appear, in the author, a disposition to change, for the sake of changing, that wherever the case is perfectly similar to that wherein any of the three verbs above mentioned is used in this quotation, the word will be found to be the same throughout the whole discourse. Thus, through the whole of this discourse, what our Lord authoritatively gives in charge, as from himself, is signified by the same phrase, *εγω λεγω ὑμιν* ; whatever is mentioned as standing on the foot of oral tradition, is expressed by *ερρεθη* ; part of the verb *ρεω* ; and what is mentioned as neither precept nor maxim of any kind, but as what may pass incidentally in conversation, is denoted by the verb *επω*. Another example of the different application of such words, we have, in our Lord's conversation with the chief priests and elders, in relation to the authority by which he acted⁴⁷. *Οι δε διελογιζοντο παρ' ἑαυτοις, ΑΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ, Εαν ΕΙΠΩΜΕΝ, εξ ουρανου,*

⁴⁶ Matth. v. 21, 22.

⁴⁷ Matth. xxi. 25. 27.

EPEI ἡμιν Διὰ τὴν οὐρανὸν οὐκ ἐπιστενοῦσθε αὐτῷ ;
 A little after, *EΦΗ* αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός. In the
 common translation, *And they reasoned with them-*
selves, SAYING, If we shall SAY from heaven, he will
SAY unto us, Why did ye not then believe him ?
 Afterwards, *And he SAID unto them.* Here the
 same repetition in the version is contrasted with a
 still greater variety in the original ; for we have
 no fewer than four different words in the Greek,
 rendered into our language, by repeating the
 same English verb four times. The sense of *επω*
 is the same in both passages ; the word *λεγω* is
 used here more indefinitely than in the former ;
 the verb *ειρω* approaches in meaning to the word
retort, and seems to preclude reply.

On comparing, we must perceive, that there is
 not only an awkwardness in the repetitions which
 modern languages sometimes render necessary,
 but even a feebleness in the enunciation of the
 sentiment. This consideration, when attended to,
 will be found to warrant our taking the greater
 liberty in diversifying the expression wherever
 our language permits it. For if we are often
 obliged to repeat the same, where the original
 employs different words ; and if we also retain
 the same words, where the original retains the
 same, though our own tongue would allow a
 change, the style of the version must be a bad
 representation of that of the original. It will
 have all the defects of both languages, and none
 of the riches of either. I have, therefore, taken
 the liberty to vary the expression a little, where

the genius of our tongue, in a consistency with simplicity, propriety, and perspicuity, permitted it; as it was only thus I could compensate for the restraints I was obliged to submit to, in cases wherein the sacred penmen had taken a freer range.

§ 13. CONCERNING the diversity of styles in the different Evangelists, which I cannot help considering as entitled to more attention than translators seem to have given it, I shall beg leave to make a few more observations. Of the words which I have mentioned as nearly synonymous, or at least as rendered, by most interpreters, in the same manner, some, though common in some of the Gospels, do not occur in others; yet, in no version that I know, is this always to be discovered. The verb *ρεω*, *I say*, is used by Matthew often, by Mark once, but never by either Luke or John. The synonyme *ειρω* is used by all except John, and *ερω* by all except Mark. *Ανακλινω*, *I lay down*, occurs in all the Gospels except John's; *κατακειμαι*, *I lie down*, in all except Matthew's. Every one of the Evangelists has also many words to be found in none of the rest; and that not only when peculiar things are mentioned by him, but when the same things, the same actions, the same circumstances, which are taken notice of by other Evangelists, are related. These, it is, sometimes, impossible to translate justly in different words. Luke, sometimes, in addressing God, uses the word *δεσποτης*, which is not in any of the other Evangelists, and can hardly be ren-

dered otherwise than *Lord*, the term whereby *κυριος*, which occurs in them all, is commonly translated. Luke is also peculiar in giving Jesus Christ the title *επιστατης*, which cannot well be rendered otherwise than *master*, the common rendering of *διδασκαλος*, though, as Grotius observes, the words are not perfectly equivalent. Matthew has, in one passage, applied to our Lord a title not used by any other, *καθηγητης*, which our translators have also rendered *master*, and have thereby impaired the sense. In like manner the multiplicity of inflections in the tenses, moods, and voices of their verbs, supplies them with a variety of expressions which serve to diversify their style in a manner not to be imitated in modern tongues, and less perhaps in English, which has very few inflections, than in any other. Add to the aforesaid advantages, in respect of variety, which the writers of the New Testament derived from their language, the derivatives and compounds with which that copious tongue so remarkably abounds.

Now, I do not know any stronger indications of a native difference of style than those above mentioned, and in part exemplified. And, as this difference conveys some evidence of the authenticity of the writings, it ought not to be always disregarded by translators, merely because it is not possible always to preserve it in their versions. It is then in effect preserved, when they give such a turn to the expression, as renders the difference of phraseology nearly equal upon the whole. This, however, ought never to be attempted, when

either the sense may be ever so little altered by it, or the simplicity and perspicuity of the sentence may be injured. What has been now observed will account for my employing words sometimes, which, though not unusual or obscure, are not the most obvious, and for giving such a turn to the expression, as renders it less literal than it might otherwise have been.

§ 14. I HAVE avoided, as much as possible, the use of circumlocution : yet there are certain cases where we cannot avoid it entirely, and do justice to our author. I do not mean barely, when there is not a single word in the language of the translation which conveys the sense of the original term ; but when there is something, either in the application, or in the argument, that cannot be fully exhibited without the aid of some additional terms. It has been often observed that, in no two languages, do the words so perfectly correspond, that the same terms in one will always express the sense of the same terms in the other. There is a difference of extent in meaning which hinders them from suiting exactly, even when they coincide in the general import. The epithet *αχρεῖος*, as applied in the Gospel of Luke⁴⁸, is so far from suiting the sense of the English word *unprofitable*, by which it is rendered in the common translation, that if we were to give a definition of an unprofitable servant, we should hardly think of another than the reverse of the character given in that

⁴⁸ Luke, xvii. 10.

passage, but should say, ' he is one who does not ' that to his master which is his duty to do.' From the context, however, no person can be at a loss to see, that the import of the word is, " We " have conferred no favour, we have only fulfilled " the terms which we were bound to perform." I know that because the sentiment is not expressed with the brevity of the original, many would call this a comment, or rather a paraphrase, and not a version. It is expressed, I acknowledge, by a periphrasis ; but periphrasis and paraphrase are not synonymous terms. The former is in every translation sometimes necessary, in order to transmit the genuine thought and reasoning of the author ; it is only when more than this is attempted, and when other sentiments are introduced or suggested, for the sake of illustrating an author's thoughts, or enforcing his arguments, that men employ paraphrase. It is not denied, that periphrasis in translating, ought to be avoided, if possible ; but it is not always possible to avoid it, and periphrasis is preferable to single words, which either convey no meaning ; or convey a meaning different from the author's.

The word βαπτισμα, in the question put by our Lord, Το βαπτισμα Ιωαννου ποθεν ην⁴⁹ ; does not answer to the word *baptism*, as used by us ; nor does αναστασις, in the account given of the Sadducees⁵⁰, correspond entirely to the English word *resurrection* : the word επαγγελια is, for the

⁴⁹ Matth. xxi. 25.

⁵⁰ Matth. xxii. 23.

most part, rendered *promise*, and means neither more nor less. In a few cases, however, it does not signify the promise itself, but the thing promised. Now the English word is never so applied. Hence the obscurity, not to say impropriety, of that expression, *I send the promise of my Father upon you*⁵¹, which, if it can be said to suggest any thing to an English reader, suggests awkwardly, *I give you a promise on the part of my Father*. Yet this is not the sense. What is here meant is the fulfilment of a promise formerly given them by his Father, and is therefore properly rendered, *I send you that which my Father hath promised*. Though not attending to this difference, our translators have thrown great darkness on some passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews. *These all* (says the writer, speaking of Abraham, Sarah, and others) *died in the faith, not having received the promises*, μη λαβοντες τας επαγγελιας⁵². Yet this way interpreted, the assertion is contradictory, not only to the patriarchal history, but to what is said expressly of Abraham in the same chapter⁵³. The words, therefore, ought to have been rendered, *not having received the promised inheritance*; for it is the land of Canaan promised to Abraham and his posterity, to which the writer particularly refers, giving as an evidence that they had not received it, their acknowledging themselves to be *strangers and sojourners in the land*; not on the

⁵¹ Luke, xxiv. 49. See all these passages in this Translation, and the notes upon them. ⁵² Heb. xi. 13. ⁵³ viii. &c.

earth, as it is, particularly in this place, very improperly translated.

§ 15. AGAIN, suppose, which is not uncommon, that the original word has two different, but related senses, and that the author had an allusion to both. Suppose also that in the language of the interpreter there is a term adapted to each of those senses, but not any one word that will suit both. In such cases perspicuity requires somewhat of periphrasis. If we abruptly change the word in the same sentence, or in the same argument, there will appear an incoherence in the version, where there appears a close connection in the original; and if we retain the same term, there will be both obscurity and impropriety in the version. I shall explain my meaning by examples, the only way of making such criticisms understood.

In one place in Matthew ⁵⁴, the verb *τιμάω* is employed, as usual, to express the duty which children owe to their parents. *To honour* is that commonly used in English. Yet this word is not equivalent in import to the Greek verb, much less to the Hebrew כָּבַד *chabad*, translated *τιμάω* by the Seventy in the place quoted by the Evangelist. This is one of the causes of the obscurity and apparent inconsequence of that passage in the Gospel. I have, therefore, rendered the word, where it occurs the second time in the argument

⁵⁴ Matth. xv. 4, 5.

used by our Lord, *honour by his assistance* ; for the original implies no less.

The Apostle Paul, writing to the Romans (for it is not necessary here to confine myself to the Gospels,) says ⁵⁵, as it is expressed in the common version, *But they have not all obeyed the Gospel ; for Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report ? So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.* What the Apostle introduces here with *So then*, as a direct conclusion from the words of the Prophet, cannot fail to appear remote to an English reader, and to require some intermediate ideas to make out the connection. The incoherency disappears entirely, when we recur to the original, where the words are : *Αλλ' ου παντης εϋπηκουσαν τω ευαγγελιω. Ησαιας γαρ λεγει, Κυρει, τις επιστευσε τη ακοη ημων ; Αρα η πιστις εξ ακοης, η δε ακοη δια ρηματος Θεου.* Nothing can be more clearly consequential, than the argument as expressed here. Isaiah had said, complaining of the people, *Τις επιστευσε τη ακοη ημων* ; from which the Apostle infers, that it commonly holds *ΠΙΣΤΙΣ* εξ *ΑΚΟΗΣ*, otherwise there had been no scope for complaint. But, by the change of the term in English, from *report* to *hearing*, however nearly the ideas are related, the expression is remarkably obscured. It must be owned, that we have no word, in English, of equal extent, in signification, with the Greek *ακοη*, which denotes both the *report*, or the thing

⁵⁵ Rom. x. 16, 17.

heard, and the sensation of hearing; though, in regard to the sense of seeing, the English word *sight* is of equal latitude; for it denotes both the thing seen, and the perception received by the eye⁵⁶. But, when such a difference as this happens, between the import of their words and ours, one does more justice to the original, and interprets more strictly, by giving the sentence such a turn as will preserve the verbal allusion, than by such a change of the terms as our translators have adopted, to the no small injury of perspicuity. The passage may, therefore, properly be rendered thus: *For Isaiah saith, "Lord, who believeth what he heareth us preach?" So then, belief cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God preached.* Nor is the addition of the participle *preached*, to be considered as a supply, from conjecture, of what is not expressed in the original; for, in fact, the word *ακουη* here implies it. Diodati has not badly translated it *preaching*. *Signore, chi a creduto alla nostra predicatione? La fede adunque e dalla predicatione.* This is better than the English version, as it preserves clearly the connection of the two verses. It is, nevertheless, of importance, not to suppress the other signification of *ακουη*, to wit, *hearing*, as, by means of it, the connection is rendered clearer, both with the preceding words, *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard*⁵⁷? and with the

⁵⁶ See an excellent illustration of this in Dr. Beattie's Essay on Truth, Part II. Ch. II. Sect. I.

⁵⁷ Rom. x. 14.

following, *But, I say, Have they not heard* ⁵⁸? I shall only add, that where the coincidence in the sense is very clear, the grammatical relation between the words is of less importance. There is, in this passage, a verbal connection, not only between the words *ακουω* and *ακουη*, but also between *πιστευω* and *πιστις*. But the English word *faith*, being fully equivalent to the Greek word *πιστις*, and its connection with believing being evident, it is not of great moment to preserve in English the affinity in sound. As such resemblances, however, always in some degree assist attention, and are a sort of evidence, it is rather better to retain them, where, without hurting the sense, it can be done. For this reason, I prefer the word *belief*, here, to the word *faith*.

I shall give but one other example, which, though not requiring the aid of circumlocution, is of a nature somewhat similar to the former. A verb, or an epithet, in the original, is sometimes construed with a noun, used figuratively, and is also construed, because use permits the application, with that which is represented by the figure; whereas, in the translator's language, the term by which the verb or epithet is commonly rendered, is not equally susceptible of both applications. In such cases, it is better, when the thing is practicable, to change the word for one which, though less common, suits both. The following passage will illustrate my meaning ⁵⁹. *Περιεχει εν τη γραφη* “*Ιδου τιθημι εν Σιων λιθον ακρογωνια-*

⁵⁸ Ver. 18.

⁵⁹ 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7.

“ιον, εκλεκτον, εντιμον και ο πιστευων επ αυτω, ου
 “μη καταισχυνηθη.” Ὑμιν ουν ἡ τιμη τοις πιστευου-
 σιν απειθουσι δε, λιθον ον απεδοκιμασαν οι οικοδο-
 μουντες, ετος εγεννηθη εις κεφαλην γωνιας : which
 our translators render thus : *It is contained in the
 Scripture, “Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-
 “stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on
 “him shall not be confounded.” Unto you, therefore,
 which believe, he is precious : but unto them which
 be disobedient, the stone which the builders disal-
 lowed, the same is made the head of the corner.*
 Here the type and the antitype are so blended, as
 to hurt, alike, both perspicuity and propriety. To
 speak of *believing in a stone, an elect stone*, and to
 apply the pronoun *him* to a stone, sound very
 oddly in our language ; but πιστευω επι, in the
 Hellenistic idiom, and εκλεκτος, admit an applica-
 tion either to persons or to things. The apostle
 said επ αυτω, because λιθος is of the masculine
 gender : for the like reason, he would have said
 επ αυτη, had he used πετρα instead of λιθος.
 Would our translators, in that case, have rendered
 it, *He who believeth on her?* Now, the English
 verb, *to trust*, and the participle *selected*, are sus-
 ceptible of both applications. Let the passage,
 then, be rendered thus : *It is said in Scripture,
 “Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, select-
 “ed and precious : whosoever trusteth to it shall
 “not be ashamed.” There is honour, therefore, to
 you who trust ; but to the mistrustful, the stone
 which the builders rejected, is made the head of the
 corner.* I may remark, in passing, that ἡ τιμη

is here evidently opposed to ἡ αἰσχυνή, the import of which is included in the verb καταισχυνθη; instead of *shame* ye shall have *honour*; but by no rule, that I know, can it be translated, *he is precious*. Απειθουσι, though often justly rendered *disobedient*, rather signifies, here, *mistrustful, incredulous*, being contrasted to πιστευουσι. All the above examples are calculated to show, that it is as impossible for a translator, if he preserve that uniformity in translating so much insisted on by some, to convey perspicuously, or even intelligibly, the meaning of the author, and to give a just representation of his manner, as it is to retain any regard to purity in the language which he writes: and that, therefore, this absurd κακοζηλια subverts, alike, all the principal ends which he ought to have in view.

§ 16. It was admitted, that it is necessary to employ more words than one in the version, when the original term requires more for conveying the sense into the language of the translator. Nobody doubts the propriety of rendering προσωποληπτης, *respector of persons*, φιλαργυρια, *love of money*, or αποσυναγωγος, *expelled the synagogue*; and it is hardly possible to give the meaning in another language, without the aid of some such periphrasis. Yet even this rule, however general it may appear, does not hold invariably. There are cases wherein it is better to leave part of the meaning unexpressed, than, by employing circumlocution, not only to desert simplicity, but to suggest something foreign to the intention of the author.

That this will sometimes be the consequence of an over-scrupulous solicitude to comprehend every thing that may be implied in the original term, will be evident on reflection. Zaccheus, the publican, said to our Lord⁶⁰, *Εἰ τινος τι εσυκοφανησά, αποδιδωμι τετραπλουν*, which our translators have rendered, *If I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him four-fold*. In this they have followed Beza, and Leo de Juda, who say *Si quid cuiquam per calumniam eripui, reddo quadruplum*. Admitting the justness of the note subjoined by the latter, in regard to the artifices of the publicans, I approve much more the version of the word in the Vulgate and Erasmus, *Si quid aliquem defraudavi*, or in Castalio, to the same purpose, *Si quem ulla re fraudavi*, “If in aught I have wronged any man;” than those anxious attempts, by tracing little circumstances, to reach the full import of the original. My objection to such attempts, is not so much because they render the expression unnecessarily complex, but because something foreign to the intention of the author, rarely fails to be suggested by them. However paradoxical it may at first appear, it is certainly true, that to express a thing in one word, and to express it in several, makes sometimes a difference, not only in the style, but in the meaning. I need not go further, for an example, than the words on which I am remarking. For a man, in the station of Zaccheus, who was probably not liable to the charge of being injurious in any other way than that to which his business ex-

⁶⁰ Luke, xix. 8.

posed him, nothing could be more natural, or more apposite, than the expression which the Evangelist represents him as having used, *ει τινος τι εσυκοφαντησα*. On the contrary, it would not have been natural in him to say, *ει τι εκλεψα*, or *ει τι εσυλησα*, because his manner of life, and his circumstances, set him above the suspicion of the crimes of theft and robbery. Such things, therefore, are not supposed to enter the person's mind. But when we substitute a circumlocution, that is, a definition, for the name of a crime, other kindred crimes are necessarily conceived to be in view; because it is always by the aid of the genus, and the difference, somehow signified, that the species is defined. Now, in a case like the present, wherein the purpose of restitution is explicitly declared, to introduce mention of the genus, with the limitation denoted by the specific difference, is an implicit declaration, that the promise of reparation shall not be understood to extend to any other species of injuries. Had our language been that spoken in Judea, and had this humble publican, when he made his penitent declaration to his Lord, said in English, *I will restore four-fold, if in aught I have wronged any man*; can we imagine, that he would have clogged his pious purpose, with the reserve which the additional words, *by false accusation*, manifestly imply? Who sees not that, in this manner introduced, they are such a restriction of the promise, as is equivalent to the retracting of it in part, and saying, 'Let it be observed, that as to any other sort of wrong I may

‘ have committed, I promise nothing ?’ But when the thing is expressed in one word, as in the Greek, no such effect is produced. Much, therefore, of the meaning, depends on the form of the expression, as well as on the import of [the words.

§ 17. BUT this is not the only bad consequence which results from the excessive solicitude of interpreters, to comprehend in their translation, by the aid of periphrasis, every thing supposed to be included in the original term. A single word is sometimes used, with energy and perspicuity, as a trope. But if we substitute a definition for the single word, we destroy the trope, and often render the sentence nonsensical. To say, *The meek shall inherit the earth*⁶¹, is to employ the word *inherit* in a figurative sense, which can hardly be misunderstood by any body, as denoting the facility with which they shall obtain possession, and the stability of the possession obtained. But, if we employ circumlocution, and say, in the manner of some interpreters, *The meek shall succeed to the earth by hereditary right*; by so explicit, and so formal, a limitation of the manner, we exclude the trope, and affirm what is palpably inapplicable, and therefore ridiculous; for, *to obtain by hereditary right*, is to succeed, in right of consanguinity, to the former possessor, now deceased. In such cases, if the translator’s language cannot convey the trope, in one word, with sufficient clearness, a

⁶¹ Matth. v. 5.

plain and proper term is much preferable to such attempts at expressing, in several words, a figure, whose whole effect results from its simplicity and conciseness.

§ 18. It is proper also to observe, that the idiom of one language will admit, in a consistency with elegance and energy, redundancies in expression, which have a very different effect, translated into another language. A few examples of this occur in the New Testament. *Υποποδιων ποδων αυτου* ⁶², is adequately rendered, in the common translation, *his footstool*, but is literally *footstool of his feet*. It is the version given by the Seventy of the Hebrew phrase רגליו הרם, in which there is no pleonasm. Our translators have imitated them in rendering *ποιμην των προβατων* *shepherd of the sheep* ⁶³, for here the redundancy is only in the version. The words *ανηρ* and *ανθρωπος*, are often by Greek authors, especially the Attic, construed with other substantives which, by a peculiar idiom, are used adjectively ⁶⁴. Matthew joins *ανθρωπος* with *εμπορος* ⁶⁵, with *οικοδεσποτης* ⁶⁶, with *βασιλευς* ⁶⁷; and John prefixes it to *αμαρτωλος* ⁶⁸. Luke, in similar cases,

⁶² Matth. v. 35.

⁶³ John, x. 2.

⁶⁴ This idiom is not peculiarly Greek. In Genesis, xiii. 8. *We are brethren*, is, in Hebrew, אנחנו אחים, in the Septuagint, ανθρωποι αδελφοι ημεις εσμεν, *We are men brethren*. Other examples might be produced.

⁶⁵ Matth. xiii. 45.

⁶⁶ Matth. xiii. 52.

⁶⁷ Matth. xviii. 23.

⁶⁸ John, ix. 16.

employs *ανηρ*, joining it to *αμαρτωλος*⁶⁹, *προφητης*⁷⁰, *φονευσ*⁷¹. In some instances our translators have very properly dropt the redundant term; in others, for I know not what reason, they have retained it. Thus dropping it, they say *a prophet*, *a murderer*, and *a certain king*. On another occasion, in order to include both words, they say *a merchant-man*. But use, whose decisions are very arbitrary, has long appropriated this name to *a trading ship*. They say also *a man that is a householder*, *a man that is a sinner*⁷², and, in one place, not badly, *a sinful man*⁷³. In these, however, we must acknowledge, there is no deviation from the meaning. Such superfluous words as some of those now mentioned, enfeeble the expression, but without altering or darkening the sense.

But there is one case wherein this use of the noun, *ανηρ*, has, in the common version, occasioned a small deviation from the meaning. The words *ανδρες αδελφοι* frequently occur in the Acts, and are always rendered by our translators, *Men and brethren*, as if the phrase were *ανδρες, και αδελφοι*, thereby making them two distinct appellations. This I once thought peculiar to English translators, but have since found that the same method is in one place adopted by Luther, in his German

⁶⁹ Luke, v. 8. xix. 7.

⁷⁰ Luke, xxiv. 19.

⁷¹ Acts, iii. 13.

⁷² Luke, xix. 7. John, ix. 16.

⁷³ Luke, v. 8.

translation, who says, *Ihr männer und bruder*⁷⁴. Some foreign versions have scrupulously preserved the pleonastic form; one says *hommes freres*, another *huomini fratelli*; which are equally awkward in French and Italian, as *men brethren* would be in English; but into none of the versions in these languages which I have seen, is the conjunction inserted. Our interpreters must have proceeded on the supposition, that the Apostles, by such compellations, divided their hearers into two classes, one of whom they barely denominated *men*, the other they more affectionately saluted *brethren*. But that there is no foundation for this conceit is manifest; first, in that case, by the syntactic order, the copulative *και* must have been inserted between the titles. Yet, though *ανδρες αδελφοι* occurs in the Acts no fewer than thirteen times, no example of *ανδρες και αδελφοι* is to be found. Secondly, it is, as was signified above, entirely in the Greek idiom. *Ανδρες στρατιωται soldiers*, *ανδρες δικασται judges*, in like manner as *ανδρες Αθηναιοι Athenians*, are warranted by the examples of Demosthenes, and the best writers in Greece. Thirdly, there is the same reason to introduce the copulative in the other examples above quoted, and to render *ανθρωπος εμπορος a man and a merchant*, *ανηρ αμαρτωλος, a man and a sinner*, and so of the rest, as *ανδρες αδελφοι men and brethren*. It may be thought that in the address *Ανδρες αδελφοι και πατερες*, as no conjunction is needed in the version

⁷⁴ Acts, i. 16.

but what is expressed in the original, the word *men* ought to be preserved. But the use above examined sufficiently shows that, in all such cases, the word *ανδρες* is to be considered not as a separate title, but as an idiomatic supplement to *αδελφοι και πατερες*, the only titles given, and that therefore in translations into modern tongues, it ought to be dropt as an expletive which does not suit their idiom. The above criticism will also serve as one of the many evidences, that what is vulgarly called the most literal translation, is not always the most close.

§ 19. IT may be proper also to observe, that the import of diminutives is not always to be determined by the general rules laid down by grammarians. *Βιβλιον* is only in form a diminutive of *βιβλιος*, *οικια* of *οικος*, *δαιμονιον* of *δαιμων*; the same may be said of *εριφιον* as used in the Gospel. It cannot be understood as expressing littleness; for what is called *εριφια* in the only place where the word occurs⁷⁵, is *εριφοι* in the verse immediately preceding. The like may be said of *οναριον* and *ονος*. And the application in that passage shows sufficiently, that it is not an expression of affection or tenderness. *Πινακιδιον* in Luke⁷⁶, denotes a thing differing rather in kind and use, than in dimensions from *πιναξ*, as used by the same Evangelist⁷⁷. Some diminutives are intended to mark a distinction only in age or in

⁷⁵ Matth. xxv. 33.

⁷⁶ Luke, i. 63.

⁷⁷ Luke, xi. 39.

size, as *θυγατριον, βιβλαριδιον, οψαριον, ιχθυδιον, κλινιδιον, πλοιαριον, παιδιον, παιδαριον*; and may be rendered into English by the aid of the epithet *little*, as *little daughter, little book, little fish*, or by a single word adapted to the meaning in the passage where it occurs, as *couch, boat, child, boy, infant*. *Τεχνιον* appears, on the contrary, more expressive of affection, than of size; *τεκνια* is therefore better rendered *dear children*, than *little children*, which, when addressed to grown persons, sounds very oddly. Sometimes the diminutive expresses contempt. In this way the word *γυναικαρια* is used by Paul⁷⁸, and is not badly translated *silly women*. But, in many cases, it must be acknowledged that the difference which a diminutive makes, though real, is of too delicate a nature to be transfused into a version. For when a translator, because the language which he writes, does not afford a term exactly equivalent, makes a stretch for a word; that word often farther exceeds the import of the original, than the common term would have fallen below it. For example, in the check which our Lord at first gave to the application of the Syrophenician woman, I consider the diminutive *κυναρια* as more emphatical in that place than *κυνες*; yet I think it is incomparably better rendered in the common version *dogs*, than in that of the anonymous translator *puppies*.

Nay, in the few cases (for they are but few, in which our language has provided us with

⁷⁸ 2 Tim. iii. 6.

diminutives, it is not always proper to render the Greek diminutive by the English. *Ἀρνιον*, for example, is in Greek the diminutive of *αἰς*, so is *lambkin* of *lamb* in English, which is the only proper version of *αἰς*. To translate *Ἀρνιον* *lambkin*, must therefore be entirely agreeable to the laws of literal interpretation. Yet, who that understands English, would hesitate to affirm that a translator who should so render the word, wherever it occurs in the New Testament, would betray a great defect both of taste and of judgment? This is one of the many evidences we have that, without knowing somewhat of the sentiments and manners of a people, with which the genius of their language is intimately connected, we may, in translating their works, exhibit an uncouth representation of the dead letter, but are not qualified for transfusing into the version, the sense and spirit of their writings. The Greek abounds in diminutives of every kind, though used but sparingly in the Gospels; nay, even in the diminutives of diminutives. They are admitted into all kinds of composition, both prosaic and poetical; the most solemn as well as the most ludicrous. It is quite otherwise with us. We have but few of that denomination, and those few are hardly ever admitted into grave discussions. They are in a manner confined to pastoral poetry and romance, or at best to performances whose end is amusement rather than instruction. It is only in these that such words as *lordling*, *baby*, *manikin*, could be tolerated. *Ἀρνιον*, in Greek, is a word of sufficient dignity, which *lambkin* in English is not.

This term shows rather a playful than a serious disposition in the person who uses it. I have been the more particular here in order to show that, if we would translate with propriety, more knowledge is requisite than can be furnished by lexicons and grammars. So much for what, in translating, concerns the justness of expression necessary for promoting the author's intention, and conveying his sentiments.

§ 20. NEXT to the justness, the perspicuity of what is said will be universally admitted to be, of all the qualities of style, the most essential. Some indeed seem to think that this is peculiarly the author's province, and no farther the translator's, than he has the warrant of his original. Such was the opinion of Le Clerc, a man of considerable name in literature. "Quamvis Latina lingua," says he⁷⁹, "perspicuitate multo magis quam Hebraica gaudeat, imo vero obscuritatem, quantum potest, vitare soleat : ubi Hebraica obscura sunt, translationem nostram obscuriorem esse non diffitemur. Sed ut ea demum effigies laudatur, non quæ vultum formosum spectant, sed qualis est revera, spectantium oculis offert ; sic translatio, ubi archetypus sermo clarus est, clara ; ubi obscurus obscura esse debet." This judgment he qualifies with the following words : "Obscura autem hic vocamus, non quæ Hebraicæ linguæ nesciis obscura sunt, sic enim pleræque loquutiones scripturæ obscuræ essent,

⁷⁹ Proleg. in Pent. Diss. II. § 4.

“ sed quæ a linguæ non imperitis hodie non satis
 “ intelliguntur. Contra vero clara esse dicimus,
 “ non ea tantum quæ omnibus, etiam imperitis
 “ aperta sunt, sed quæ linguæ peritioribus nullum
 “ negotium facessunt.” But even with this quali-
 fication the sentiment does not appear defensible.
 It makes the standard of perspicuity what it is im-
 possible for any person exactly to know, namely,
 the degree of knowledge in the original attained
 (not by the translator, but) by the learned in gen-
 eral in the Oriental languages at the time. “ Ob-
 “ scura vocamus quæ a linguæ non imperitis *hodie*,
 “ non satis intelliguntur.” In consequence of
 which the Scriptures ought to be translated more
 perspicuously at one time than at another, be-
 cause the original is better understood at one time
 than at another. That in fact they will be so,
 when in the hands of a translator of superior
 capacity and knowledge, cannot be questioned.
 But, by this critic’s rule, if I understand him right,
 the interpreter ought not to avail himself of
 greater abilities, if he have greater abilities ; but,
 however clear the sentiments are to him, he
 ought to render them obscurely, if the original
 appear obscure to the critics of the age. In this
 case, it would be of little consequence, whether
 the translator were profoundly skilled in the
 languages or not. The only thing of importance
 would be, that he were well versed in the inter-
 pretations and comments of others. This is so
 absurd, that I cannot allow myself to think that
 it was the fixed opinion of that critic, or the rule

by which he conducted himself in translating ; yet it is hardly possible to put another construction upon his words.

§ 21. HOUBIGANT, without minding the qualification above quoted, severely censures the general position, that the obscurities of an author ought to be rendered obscurely. “Obscurus,” says he⁸⁰, “est non semel Horatius ; num igitur laudanda ea erit Horatii Gallica interpretatio, quæ Horatium faciet Gallico sermone, ubi clarus est, clare, ubi obscurus, obscure loquentem ?” I must, however, say so much for Le Clerc, as to acknowledge, that the cases compared by Houbigant, are not parallel. Greater freedom may reasonably be used with profane authors than with the sacred. If the general tenour and connection be preserved in the thoughts of a Greek or Latin poet, and if the diction be harmonious and elegant, a few mistakes about the import of words, by which the scope of the whole is little affected, will be thought, even by the most fastidious critics, a more pardonable fault than such obscurity as interrupts a reader, and makes it difficult for him to divine the sense. But it is otherwise with a book of so great authority as the Scriptures. It is better that, in them, the reader should sometimes be at a loss about the sentiment, than that he should have a false sentiment imposed upon him for a dictate of the Spirit of God. I approve much more what follows in Houbigant : “Humani

⁸⁰ Proleg. Cap. V. Art. III.

“ingenii est, non linguæ cujuscunque obscuritas,
 “divini sermonis dos perpetua, ut dignitas, ita
 “etiam perspicuitas. Ut quanquam obscura nunc
 “esset Hebraica lingua, tamen dubitandum non
 “esset quæ sacri autores scripserunt, perspicue
 “scripsisse: nobis igitur esse maxime elaboran-
 “dum, ut quæ nunc nobis obscura esse videantur,
 “ad pristinam nativamque perspicuitatem, quoad
 “fieri potest, revocemus; non autem nos nobis
 “contentos esse debere, si quæ prima specie ob-
 “scura erant, obscure converterimus.” I have
 already given my reasons⁸¹ for thinking that the
 historical style of the Scriptures, in consequence
 of its greater simplicity, is naturally more per-
 spicuous than that of most other writings. But
 it is impossible that their sense should appear,
 even to men of profound erudition, with the same
 facility and clearness, as it did to the countrymen
 and contemporaries of the inspired writers, men
 familiarized to their idiom, and well acquaintèd
 with all the customs and manners to which there
 are, in those writings, incidental allusions. If
 then, to adopt Le Clerc’s similitude, we prefer
 likeness to the original before beauty, we must
 endeavour to make our translation as perspicuous
 to our readers, as we have reason to think the
 writings of Moses were, not to modern linguists,
 but to the ancient Israelites, and the writings of
 the Evangelists to the Hellenist Jews. This is
 the only way, in my judgment, in which, consis-

⁸¹ Diss. III.

tently with common sense, we can say that a resemblance, in perspicuity, is preserved in the translation.

§ 22. BUT, it may be asked, Is there then no case whatever, wherein it may be pardonable, or even proper, to be, in some degree, obscure? I acknowledge that there are such cases, though they occur but seldom in the historical books. First, it is pardonable to be obscure, or even ambiguous, when it is necessary for avoiding a greater evil. I consider it as a greater evil in a translator, to assign a meaning merely from conjecture, for which he is conscious he has little or no foundation. In such cases, the method taken by Castalio, is the only unexceptionable method, to give a literal translation of the words, and acknowledge our ignorance of the meaning. For the same reason, there will be a propriety in retaining even some ambiguities in the version. But this method ought to be taken, only when the interpreter, using his best judgment, thinks there is ground to doubt which of the two senses, suggested by the words, is the meaning of the author. If the language of the version be susceptible of the same ambiguity which he finds in the original, it ought to be preserved; but if the language be not susceptible of it, which often happens, the translator should insert the meaning he prefers in the text, and take notice of the other in the notes, or on the margin.

I shall give some examples of both. The Evangelist John says ⁸², *Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἀνθρώπον ἐρχομένον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.* Here we have an ambiguity in the word *ἐρχομένον*, which may be either the nominative neuter, agreeing with *φῶς*, or the accusative masculine, agreeing with *ἀνθρώπον*. Our translators have preferred the latter meaning, and said, *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* It was hardly possible to preserve the native simplicity of the expression, and retain the ambiguity in English. I have, therefore, as I preferred the former meaning, rendered the verse, *The true light was he, who coming into the world, enlighteneth every man,* and mentioned the other sense in the note, assigning the reasons which determined my choice.

Another Evangelist represents our Lord as saying ⁸³, *Λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθησάντες μοι, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.* Here the clause *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ*, may be construed, either with the preceding words, or with the following. In the former of these ways our translators have understood them, and have, therefore, rendered the verse, *I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration; when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* I think, on the contrary,

⁸² John, i. 9.

⁸³ Matth. xix. 28.

that the words ought to be understood in the latter way, and have, therefore, translated them in this manner: *I say unto you, that at the renovation, when the Son of man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel.* For this choice I have assigned my reasons in the note on the passage.

§ 23. BUT it sometimes happens, that the preference of one of the meanings of an equivocal word or phrase, cannot be determined with probability sufficient to satisfy a candid critic. In this case, when the version can be rendered equally susceptible of the different meanings, candour itself requires, that the interpreter give it this turn. By so doing, he puts the unlearned reader on the same footing on which the learned reader is put by the author. It does not often happen that this is possible, but it happens sometimes. The word *αιων* may denote, either the world, in the largest acceptation, or the age, state, or dispensation of things, answering nearly to the Latin *seculum*. There are some passages in the New Testament, on which probable arguments may be advanced in favour of each interpretation. Nay, some have plausibly contended, that in the prophetic style, there is no impropriety in admitting both senses. Now, by rendering *αιων*, in those doubtful cases, *state*, the same latitude is given the sentiment in English, which the words have in the original.

See the note on this passage in Matthew ⁸⁴, *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰωνί, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μελλόντι*, which I have rendered, *will never be pardoned, either in the present state, or in the future.*

§ 24. THERE are, moreover, a few instances, in which it cannot be doubted that there is an intentional obscurity. In these it is plain, that the same degree of darkness which is found in the original ought, as far as possible, to be preserved in the version. Predictions are rarely intended to be perfectly understood till after their fulfilment, and are intended to be then understood by means of their fulfilment. When our Lord said to his disciples, in his last consolatory discourse ⁸⁵, *Within a little while ye shall not see me, a little while after ye shall see me, because I go to the Father*, we learn, from what follows, that they did not understand him. Yet, though he perceived they were puzzled, he did not think proper to clear up the matter; but, that his words might make the deeper impression upon their minds, he mentioned some additional circumstances, the triumph of the world, the sorrow of the disciples at first, and joy afterwards. He knew that his death and resurrection, which were soon to follow, would totally dissipate all doubts about his meaning. It must be injudicious, therefore, to render the verse in such a manner as to leave no room, to persons in their circumstances, for doubt and perplexity. Yet in one version it is thus translated: "In a

⁸⁴ Matth. xii. 32.

⁸⁵ John, xvi. 16.

“very little time you will not see me—in a very little time you will see me again—for I am going to the Father, shortly to return.” The last clause, *shortly to return*, for which there is no warrant in the original, removes the difficulty at once, and consequently, makes the disciples appear, in the subsequent verses, in a very strange light, as being at a loss to understand what is expressed in the clearest manner. It holds, therefore, true in general that, in translating prophecy, we ought to avoid giving the version either more or less light than is found in the original. The anonymous translator often errs in this way. Thus, in the prophecy on mount Olivet, where our Lord says⁸⁶, *These things must happen, but the end is not yet*, the last clause, *οπω εστι το τελος*, he renders, *the end of the Jewish age is not yet*. There is nothing answering to the words of *the Jewish age* in the Gospel. It is not certain that the word *τελος* here relates to the same event which is called *συντελεια του αιωνος* a little before⁸⁷. At any rate, there is no mention of *Jews*, or *Jewish*, in the whole prophecy. Nay, if it were absolutely certain, that the meaning is what this interpreter has expressed, it would be wrong to render it so, because we have reason to conclude, that it was not without design that our Lord, on that occasion, employed more general terms.

⁸⁶ Matth. xxiv. 6.⁸⁷ Ver. 3.

§ 25. IN some cases, it is particularly unsuitable to be more explicit than the sacred authors, how certain soever we be that we express the meaning. A little reflection must satisfy every reasonable person, that events, depending on the agency of men, cannot, with propriety, be revealed, so as to be perfectly intelligible to those on whose agency they depend. For, if we suppose that the things predicted, are such as they would not knowingly be the instruments of executing, either it will be in their power to defeat the intention of the prophecy, or they must be over-ruled in their actions by some blind fatality, and consequently cannot be free agents in accomplishing the prediction. Neither of these suits the methods of Providence. God does not force the wills of his creatures; but he makes both their errors and their vices conduce to effect his wise and gracious purposes. This conduct of Providence was never more eminently displayed, than in what related to the death and sufferings of the Son of God. The predictions of the ancient prophets are so apposite, and so clearly explained by the events, that we are at no loss to apply them; nay, we find some difficulty in conceiving how they could fail of being understood by those who were the instruments of their accomplishment. Yet, that they were misunderstood by them, we have the best authority to affirm: *I wot*, says Peter⁸⁸, to the people of Jerusalem, who had, with clamour, demanded of Pilate

⁸⁸ Acts, iii. 17, 18.

the crucifixion of Jesus, *that, through ignorance, ye did it, as did also your rulers ; but those things which God before had shewed, by the mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled.* The predictions in the Gospel are conveyed in the same idiom, and under the like figurative expressions, as are those of the Old Testament. And, though many of the events foretold, which are now accomplished, have put the meaning of such prophecies beyond all question, we ought not, in translating them, to add any light borrowed, merely, from the accomplishment. By so doing, we may even materially injure the history, and render those mistakes incredible, which, on a more exact representation of things, as they must have appeared at the time, were entirely natural.

§ 26. THE commentator's business ought never to be confounded with the translator's. It is the duty of the latter to give every thing to his readers, as much as possible, with the same advantages, neither more nor fewer, with which the sacred author gave it to his contemporaries. There were some things which our Saviour said, as well as some things that he did, to his disciples, which it was not intended that they should understand then, but which, if taken notice of then, and remembered, they would understand afterwards. *These things, said our Lord⁸⁹, I have spoken to you in figures ; the time cometh when I shall no longer speak to you in figures ; but instruct you plainly*

⁸⁹ John, xvi. 25.

concerning the Father. It was, therefore, not intended that every thing in the Gospel should be announced, at first, with plainness. It is, withal, certain, that the veil of figurative language, thrown over some things, was employed to shade them, only for a time, and, in the end, to conduce to their evidence and greater lustre. *For there was no secret that was not to be discovered; nor was aught concealed which was not to be divulged*⁹⁰. Now, justice is not done to this wise conduct of the Spirit, unless things be represented, in this respect also, as nearly as possible, in his own manner. And those translators who have not attended to this, have sometimes, by throwing more light than was proper on particular expressions, involved the whole passage in greater darkness, and made it harder to account for the facts recorded.

§ 27. At the same time, let it be remembered, that the case of prophecy is in a great measure peculiar; and we have reason to think, that there is hardly any other case in which we are in danger of exceeding in perspicuity. Even in those places of the Gospel, about the meaning of which expositors are divided, there is ground to believe, that there is no intended obscurity in the original; but that the difficulty arises merely from an allusion to some custom, or an application of some term, at that time familiar, but at present, not easily discovered. Where the translator is in the dark, his version ought not to be decisive. But

⁹⁰ Mark, iv. 22.

where he has rational grounds for forming a judgment, what he judges to be the sense, he ought to express with clearness.

§ 28. I HAVE oftener than once had occasion to observe, that wherever propriety, perspicuity, and the idiom of the tongue employed, permit an interpreter to be *close*, the more he is so, the better. But what it is to be *literal*, I have never yet seen defined by any critic or grammarian, or even, by any advocate for the literal manner of translating. A resemblance in sound, by the frequent use of derivatives from the words of the original, cannot, where there is no coincidence in the sense, confer on a translator, even the slight praise of being literal. Who would honour with this denomination one who, in translating Scripture, should render *συμφωνια* *symphony*, *ὑπερβολη* *hyperbole*, *παροξυσμος* *paroxysm*, *φαρμακεια* *pharmacy*, *συκοφαντειν* *to play the sycophant*, *παραδοξα* *paradoxes*, *ιδιωτης* *idiot*? Yet some of the consecrated words have no better title to this distinction.

I once met with a criticism, I do not remember where, on a passage in the Epistle of James⁹¹, in which God is called the *Father of lights*, *παρ' ὧν οὐκ ἐνι παραλλαγή, ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα*. The critic profoundly supposes, that the sacred penman, though writing to the Christian converts, of the dispersed Jews, amongst whom there certainly

⁹¹ James, i. 17.

were not many noble, or rich, or learned, addressed them in the language of astronomy; and therefore renders *παραλλαγή parallax*, and *τροπή tropic*. If this be to translate very literally, it is also to translate very absurdly. And surely the plea is not stronger, that is urged in favour of those interpreters who, without regard to usage in their own language, scrupulously exhibit, in their versions, the etymologies of their author's words, especially compound words. Such, if they would preserve consistency, ought to translate *ενηθης well-bred*, *ραδιουργία easy work*, *σπερμολογος seed-gatherer*, *πανουργος all-working*, *γλωσσοκομον tongue-case*, and *παμπολυς all-many*. The similar attempts of some, at analysing phrases, or idiomatical expressions, in their version, which are but a looser sort of composition, fall under the same denomination. Both the above methods, though differing greatly from each other, are occasionally patronized as literal, by the same persons. There is a third particular, which is considered as, perhaps, more essential to this mode of interpreting, than either of the former, and which consists in tracing, as nearly as possible, in the version, the construction and arrangement of the original. This, if not carried to excess, is less exceptionable than either of the former.

§ 29. BUT, it deserves our notice, that translators attempting, in this way, to keep closely to the letter, have sometimes failed, through their attending more to words and particles, considered

separately, than to the combination and construction of the whole sentence. Thus, the words of our Lord ⁹², Πας γαρ ὁ αἰτων λαμβανει, και ὁ ζητων ἐυρισκει, as rendered in the common translation, *For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth;* err in this very way. Ὁ ζητων ἐυρισκει, taken by itself as a separate sentence, cannot be better rendered than *he that seeketh, findeth.* But in this passage it is only a clause of a sentence. The words πας γαρ, wherewith the sentence begins, relate equally to both clauses. The version here given, *For whosoever asketh, obtaineth; whosoever seeketh, findeth,* is, in fact, therefore, more 'close to the letter, as well as to the sense: for, by the syntactic order, the second clause evidently is πας ὁ ζητων ἐυρισκει. The Vulgate is both literal and just, *Omnis enim qui petit, accipit; et qui quærit, invenit.* Here *omnis*, like πας, belongs to both members. Had our translators, in the same manner, said, *Every one that asketh, receiveth; and that seeketh, findeth;* leaving out the pronoun *he*, they would have done justice both to the form and to the sense. But they have chosen rather to follow Beza, who says, *Quisquis enim petit, accipit; et qui quærit, invenit;* where, though the second member is the same as in the Vulgate, the expression in the Gospel is in effect differently translated, as *quisquis* cannot, like *omnis*, be supplied before *qui*. I acknowledge that there is not a material difference in

⁹² Matth. vii. 8. See the note on that verse.

meaning. Only the second clause in Beza is expressed more weakly, and appears not to affirm so universally as the first clause. The clause, as expressed in Greek, has no such appearance.

§ 30. FOR a similar reason, the words *οπου ο σκωλεξ αυτων ου τελευτα, και το πυρ ου σβεννυται*⁹³, are, in my opinion, more strictly rendered, *where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched*, than as in the common version, *the fire is not quenched*. The manner in which the clauses are here connected, rendered the repetition of the pronoun in the second clause unnecessary, because in Greek it is in such cases understood as repeated. Whereas in English, when *the fire* is said, the pronoun cannot be understood. It is excluded by the article, which is never by us joined with the possessive pronoun. Could we, with propriety, imitate the Greek manner entirely, making the personal pronoun supply the possessive, and saying *where the worm of them dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*, the pronoun might be understood in English as well as in Greek. But such an idiom with us would be harsh and unnatural. It gives an additional probability to this explanation, that, in the passage in the Old Testament referred to⁹⁴, it is expressly *their fire*, as well as *their worm*. In Hebrew the affixes are never left to be supplied. This remark regards

⁹³ Mark, ix. 44. 46. 48.

⁹⁴ Isaiah, lxvi. 24.

only the exhibition of the construction, for the sense is not affected by the difference.

§ 31. THE words of John, Ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιος ἐστὶ, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιος ἐστὶ⁹⁵, are, in my judgment, more literally rendered, *He that doth righteousness is righteous, even as God is righteous*, than as it stands in the English translation, *even as he is righteous*. The English pronoun *he* does not correspond to the Greek *ἐκεῖνος* so situated. In English, the sentence appears, to most readers, a mere identical proposition: in Greek it has no such appearance, *ἐκεῖνος* plainly referring us to a remote antecedent. As no pronoun, in our language, will here answer the purpose, the only proper recourse is to the noun whose place it occupies⁹⁶. The intention of the three examples just now given, is to show that, when the construction of the sentence is taken into the account, that is often found a more literal (if by this be meant *closer*) translation, which, to a superficial view, appears less so.

§ 32. I SHALL here take notice of another case in which we may translate literally, nay, justly, and perspicuously, and yet fail greatly, in respect of energy. This arises from not attending to the minute, but often important, differences in structure, between the language of the original, and that of the version. Of many such differences

⁹⁵ 1 John, iii. 7.

⁹⁶ Luke, ix. 34.

between Greek and English, I shall mention at present only one. We find it necessary to introduce some of the personal pronouns almost as often as we introduce a verb. Not only does our idiom require this, but our want of inflections constrains us to take this method for conveying the meaning. In the ancient languages this is quite unnecessary, as the inflection of the verb, in almost every case, virtually expresses the pronoun. There are certain cases, nevertheless, wherein the pronoun is also employed in those languages. But, in those cases, it has, for the most part, an emphasis which the corresponding pronoun with us, because equally necessary in every case, is not fitted for expressing. Thus our Lord says to his disciples ⁹⁷, *Ουχ' υμεις με εξελεξασθε, αλλ' εγω εξελεξαμην υμας*, which is rendered in the common version, *Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you*. This version is at once literal, just, and perspicuous; yet it has not the energy of the original. The stress laid on *υμεις* and *εγω*, which are here contrasted with manifest intention, because the words are otherwise superfluous, is but feebly, if at all, represented by the pronouns *ye* and *I*, which are, in English, necessary attendants on the verbs. Our translators could not have rendered differently, had the words been *Ου με εξελεξασθε, αλλ' εξελεξαμην υμας*. Yet every reader of taste will perceive that this expression is not nearly so emphatical. I might add that such a reader will

⁹⁷ John, xv. 16.

be sensible, that even so slight a circumstance as beginning the sentence with the negative particle, adds to the emphasis, and that *ὑμεῖς οὐ* would not have been so expressive as *οὐχ ὑμεῖς*. To do justice, therefore, to the energy, as well as to the sense of the original, it is necessary, in modern languages, to give the sentence a different turn. The Port Royal, and after them Simon, and other French translators, have done this successfully by rendering it, *Ce n'est pas vous qui m'avez choisi, mais c'est moi qui vous ai choisi*. The like turn has been given by some very properly to the words in English, *It was not you who chose me, but it was I who chose you*.

I recollect one instance in the Old Testament, wherein our translators have taken this method. Joseph, after he had discovered himself to his brethren, observing that the remembrance of their guilt overwhelmed them with terror and confusion; in order to compose their spirits, says to them⁹⁸, *It was not you that sent me hither, but God*. The expression in the Greek translation is perfectly similar to that above quoted from the Gospel. *Οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἀπεσταλκατε ὧδε, ἀλλ' ἡ ὁ Θεός*. In the original Hebrew it is not less so: ~~האלהים כי הנח אתי שלחם אתם לא~~. I do not say, however, that the pronoun, when mentioned, is, in every case, emphatical, or that, in every case, it would be proper to deviate from the more simple manner of translating.

⁹⁸ Gen. xlv. 8.

לֹא אֶתְּךָ שֶׁלַחְתָּךְ אֶתִּי הֵנִי כִי הָאֱלֹהִים

§ 33. THUS much shall suffice for what regards those leading rules in translating, which may be judged necessary for securing propriety, perspicuity, and energy; and, as far as possible, in a consistency with these, for doing justice to the particular manner of the author translated; and for bestowing on the whole, that simple kind of decoration, which is suited to its character. This finishes the first part of this Dissertation relating to the matter or principal qualities to be attended to in translating.

PART II.

THE READINGS OF THE ORIGINAL HERE FOLLOWED.

I SHALL NOW subjoin a few remarks on the readings, where there is, in the original, a diversity of reading, which are here preferred.

Were it in our power to recur to the autographies of the sacred penmen, that is, to the manuscripts written by themselves, or by those whom they employed, to whom they dictated, and whose work they supervised, there could be no question that we ought to recur to them, as the only infallible standards of divine truth. But those identical writings, it is acknowledged on all hands, are nowhere now to be found. What we have, in their stead, are the copies of copies (through how many

successions, it is impossible to say,) which were originally taken from those autographies. Now, though Christians are generally agreed in ascribing infallibility to the sacred penmen, no Christian society, or individual, that I know, has ever yet ascribed infallibility to the copiers of the New Testament. Indeed, some Christians appear absurd enough to admit thus much in favour of those who have transcribed the Old Testament; about which they seem to imagine, that Providence has been more solicitous than about the New. For, in regard to the New Testament, nothing of this kind has ever been advanced. Now, what has been said of the transcribers of the New Testament may, with equal certainty, be affirmed of the editors and printers. It is, nevertheless, true, that, since the invention of printing, we have greater security than formerly, against that incorrectness which multiplies the diversities of reading; inasmuch as now, a whole printed edition, consisting of many thousand copies, is not exposed to so many errors, as a single written copy was before. But this invention is comparatively modern. Besides, the effect it had, in point of correctness, was only to check the progress, or, more properly, to prevent the increase of the evil, by giving little scope for new variations. But it could have no retrospective effect in rectifying those already produced.

§ 2. It behoved the first editors of the New Testament in print, to employ the manuscripts of which they were possessed, with all their

imperfections. And who will pretend that Cardinal Ximenes, Erasmus, Robert Stephens, and the other early publishers of the New Testament, to whom the republic of letters is indeed much indebted, were under an infallible direction in the choice of manuscripts, or in the choice of readings in those passages wherein their copies differed from one another? That they were not all under infallible guidance, we have ocular demonstration, as, by comparing them, we see that, in many instances, they differ among themselves. And if only one was infallibly directed, which of them, shall we say, was favoured with this honourable distinction? But, in fact, though there are many well-meaning persons, who appear dissatisfied with the bare mention of various readings of the sacred text, and much more with the adoption of any reading to which they have not been accustomed, there is none who has yet ventured to ascribe infallibility, or inspiration, to any succession of copyists, editors, or printers. Yet, without this, to what purpose complain? Is it possible to dissemble a circumstance clear as day, that different copies read some things differently? a circumstance of which every person who, with but a moderate share of knowledge, will take the trouble to reflect, must be convinced that it was inevitable? Or, if it were possible to dissemble it, ought this truth to be dissembled? If, in any instance wherein the copies differ, there appear, upon inquiry, sufficient reason to believe, that the reading of one copy, or number of copies, is the dictate of inspiration, and that the reading

of the rest, though the same with that of the printed edition most in use, is not ; will the cause of truth be better served by dissimulation, in adhering to a maxim of policy, merely human, or by conveying, in simplicity, to the best of our power, the genuine sense of the Spirit ? The former methods savours too much of those pious frauds which, though excellent props to superstition, in ignorant and barbarous ages, ought never to be employed in the service of true religion. Their assistance she never needs, and disdains to use. Let us then conclude that, as the sacred writings have been immensely multiplied, by the copies which have been taken from the original manuscripts, and by the transcripts successively made from the copies ; the intrusion of mistakes into the manuscripts, and thence into printed editions, was, without a chain of miracles, absolutely unavoidable.

§ 3. IT may be thought that the transmission, through so many ages, merely by transcribing, in order to supply the place of those copies which, from time to time, have been destroyed or lost, must have, long before now, greatly corrupted the text, and involved the whole in uncertainty. Yet, in fact, the danger here is not near so great as, at first, it would appear. The multiplication of the copies, the very circumstance which occasions the increase of the evil, has, in a great measure, as it began very early, brought its own remedy along with it; namely, the opportunity it affords, of

collating those which have been made from different ancient exemplars. For, let it be observed, that different transcribers from a correct standard, rarely fall into the same errors. If, therefore, which is highly probable, as almost all those writings were originally intended for the use of multitudes, several copies were made directly from the writings of the sacred penmen, those transcripts, when the common archetype was lost, would serve, when collated, to correct one another: and, in like manner, the copies taken from one would serve to correct the copies taken from another. There are several considerations, arising from external circumstances, from which, among the different readings of different manuscripts, the preference may, with probability, be determined; such are the comparative antiquity, number, and apparent accuracy of the copies themselves. There are considerations, also, arising from internal qualities in the readings compared; such as, conformity to the grammatical construction, to the common idiom of the language, to the special idiom of the Hellenists, to the manner of the writer, and to the scope of the context. Need I subjoin the judgments that may be formed, by a small change in the pointing, or even in dividing the words? for, in these things, the critic is entitled to some latitude, as, in the most ancient manuscripts, there were neither points nor accents, and hardly a division of the words.

Next to the aid of manuscripts, is that of the Greek commentators, who give us, in their com-

mentaries, the text, as they found it at the time ; and, next to this, we have that of ancient translations. I do not mean the aid they give for discovering the import of the original terms ; for, in this respect, modern versions may be equally profitable ; but, their leading to the discovery of a different reading in the manuscripts from which they were made. In this way, modern versions are of no use to the critic, the world being still in possession of their originals. Next to ancient translations, though very far from being of equal weight, are the quotations made by the Fathers, and early ecclesiastical writers. Of the degrees of regard due, respectively, to the several assistances above named, it would be superfluous here to discourse, after what has been written by Walton, Mill, Wetstein, Simon, Michaelis, Kennicott, and many others. As we can ascribe to no manuscript, edition, or translation, absolute perfection ; we ought to follow none of them implicitly. As little ought we to reject the aid of any. On these principles I have proceeded in this version. Even the English translators have not scrupled, in a few instances, to prefer a manuscript reading to that of the printed editions, and the reading of the Vulgate to that of the Greek. Of the former, I remember two examples⁹⁹ in the Gospels, wherein our translators have adopted a reading different from the reading of the common Greek, and also different from that of the Vulgate ; and

⁹⁹ Matth. x. 10. John, xviii. 20.

not a few¹⁰⁰, wherein they have preferred the latter to the former, sometimes, in my opinion, rashly. The passages are mentioned in the margin; the reader may compare them at his leisure, and consult the notes relating to them, subjoined to this translation.

§ 4. BENGELIUS, though he consulted manuscripts, declares, that he has followed none in the edition he has given of the New Testament, unless where they supported the reading of some one, at least, of the printed editions. "This," says Bowyer¹⁰¹, "is the greatest deference that was ever paid to the press." But, with all due respect to the judgment of that worthy and learned printer, I do not think it evidence of a deference to the press, but of an extravagant deference to the first editors of the sacred books in print. The Scriptures of the New Testament had been conveyed, by manuscript, for about fourteen hundred years before the art of printing existed. As it has never been pretended that the first printers, or the first publishers, were inspired, or ought to be put on the footing of Prophets, we conclude, that if their editions contain things not warranted by the manuscripts or ancient versions then extant, such things must be erroneous, or, at least, apocryphal. And, if every thing they

¹⁰⁰ Matth. xii. 14. xxv. 39. xxvi. 15. Mark, vi. 56. Luke, i. 35. ii. 22. xi. 13. John, xvi. 2. xviii. 1. 15.

¹⁰¹ Pref. to his Critical Conjectures.

contain may be found in some manuscripts or versions of an older date, though not in all, our giving such a preference to the readings copied into the printed editions, can proceed from nothing but a blind deference to the judgment of those editors, as always selecting the best. Whether they merited this distinction, the judicious and impartial will judge. But no reasonable person can hesitate a moment to pronounce, that if, of all the readings they had met with, they had selected the worst, the press would have conveyed them down to us with equal fidelity. We may then have a prejudice in favour of the printed editions, because we are accustomed to them, but have no valid reason for preferring them to manuscripts, unless it arise from a well-founded preference of the first editors of the New Testament to all other scriptural critics, as men who had the best means of knowing what was preferable in the manuscripts, and who were the most capable of making a proper choice. But hardly will either be admitted by those who are acquainted with the state of this species of literature, at that time, and since.

§ 5. THOUGH not the first published, the first prepared for publication, was the Complutensian Polyglot, by Cardinal Ximenes, a Spaniard. The sentence, formerly quoted from him, relating to the place he had assigned the Vulgate in his edition, between the Hebrew and the Greek, and his indecent comparison of its appearance there, to our Lord crucified between the two malefactors,

do not serve to raise our opinion either of his judgment, or of his impartiality. He boasted of the use he had made of the Vatican, and other manuscripts of great antiquity, as to which Wetstein is not singular in expressing doubts of his veracity.

Erasmus is considered as the second editor. His New Testament was published, but not printed, before the Complutensian. He made use of some manuscripts of Bazil, and others, which he had collected in different parts; but he was so little scrupulous, in regard to the text, that what was illegible in the only Greek copy, he seems to have had, of the Apocalypse, he supplied, by translating back into Greek from the Vulgate. He published several editions of this work, the two or three last of which he brought to a greater conformity to the Complutensian printed at Alcalá, than his three first were.

The third editor of note, (for I pass over those who did little other than republish either Ximenes or Erasmus,) was Robert Stephens. He allowed himself, in a great measure, to be directed by the two former editors; but not without using, on several occasions, the readings which he found in some of the best manuscripts he had collected. Many of the later editions of the New Testament are formed from some of his.

Beza, indeed, who was himself possessed of some valuable manuscripts, and was supplied, by Henry Stephens, with the various readings which had been collected by his father, sometimes introduced them into the text. But his choice was directed

by no principle of criticism. His great rule of preference, (as might be expected from the manner in which he conducted his translation,) was conformity to his own theological system. This led him to introduce variations, sometimes on the authority of a single manuscript of little or no account, sometimes without even that, insomuch that several of his alterations must be considered as conjectural. Yet his edition has been much followed by Protestants. Curcellæus¹⁰² complains of him for having, by his own acknowledgment, suppressed many readings he was possessed of. Simon takes notice of the same thing¹⁰³. And, it must be owned, that Beza's conduct, in other particulars, gives ground to suspect, that his impartiality, in a matter of this kind, was not to be relied on.

The only other editor I know, who has had recourse to guessing, for the improvement of his text, is the English translator in 1729, often before mentioned. He has, along with his version, republished the Greek text, corrected, as he pretends, from authentic manuscripts. It does not, however, appear, that he has been guided by critical principles in judging of manuscripts, or of the preference due to particular readings. His chief rule seems to have been their conformity to his own notions, which has led him to employ a boldness in correcting altogether unwarrantable.

¹⁰² Pref. to his edition of the N. T. Nescio quo consilio, plurimas quas præ manibus habebat, publico inviderit.

¹⁰³ Hist. Crit. du N. T. lib. ii. cap. 29.

§ 6. WHAT follows may serve as evidence of this. Dr. Mill was so much pleased with a correction proposed by Bentley¹⁰⁴, as to say, “Mihi tantopere placet hæc lectio, ut absque unanimi codicum in altera ista lectione consensu, genui-
 “nam eam intrepide pronunciarem:” to which our editor gives this brief and contemptuous reply,—“As if there was any manuscripts so old as
 “COMMON SENSE.” The greatest regard is doubtless due to *common sense*; but, where the subject is matter of fact, the proper province of common sense lies in comparing and judging the proofs brought before it, not in supplying from invention any deficiency in these. Common sense, or rather *Reason* is the judge in the trial. Manuscripts, versions, quotations, &c. are the testimonies. It would be a bad scheme in civil matters to supercede the examination of witnesses, on pretence that the sagacity of the judge rendered it unnecessary. Yet it might be pretended, that his penetration is such, that he can discover, at a glance, the truth, or the falsity, of the charge, from the bare physiognomy of the parties. But can you imagine, that people would think their lives, liberties, and properties, secure in a country, where this were the method of trial? Or will this method, think you, be found to answer better in critical, than in judicial matters? If, under the name of COMMON SENSE, we substitute the critic’s fancy, in the room of testimony and all external evidence; we shall

¹⁰⁴ The passage, on which the correction was proposed, is Gal. iv. 25.

find, that we have established a test of criticism which is infinitely various, not in different sects only, but in different individuals. The common sense of the aforesaid English editor, and the common sense of Beza (yet neither of them was destitute of this quality,) would, I am afraid, have not very often coincided.

§ 7. SHALL we then set aside reason, or common sense, in such inquiries? On the contrary, no step can properly be taken without it. The judge is necessary in the trial, so are the witnesses: but there will be an end of all fairness, and an introduction to the most arbitrary proceedings, if the former be made to supply the place of both. In cases of this kind, we ought always to remember that the question, wherever any doubt arises, is a question of fact, not a question of right, or of abstract truth. It is, 'What was said;' not 'What should have been said;' or 'What we ourselves would have said,' had we been in the author's place. This is what we never mistake in the explanation of any pagan writer, or of any modern, but are very apt to mistake in the explanation of the Bible. If a Christian of judgment and knowledge were translating the Alcoran, there would be no risk of his confounding things so manifestly distinct. The reason is, such a translator's concern would only be to give the meaning, of his author, without either inquiring or minding, whether it were agreeable, or contrary, to his own sentiments.

Whereas, it is a thousand to one that the Christian, of whatever denomination he be, has previously to his entering on the interpretation, gotten a set of opinions concerning those points about which Scripture is conversant. As these opinions have acquired a certain firmness through habit, and as a believer in Christianity cannot, consistently, maintain tenets which he sees to be repugnant to the doctrines contained in Scripture, he will find it easier, (unless possessed of an uncommon share of candour and discernment) to bring, by his ingenuity, (especially when aided by conjectural emendations) the dictates of revelation to a conformity to his opinions, than to bring his opinions to a conformity to the dictates of revelation. This tendency is the real cause of so much straining as is sometimes to be found in the manner of criticising holy writ; straining, let me add, to a degree which we never see exemplified, in interpreting any classical author. In the latter we are, comparatively, little interested, and are therefore ready to admit, on many occasions, that such are the sentiments expressed in his writings, though very different from our sentiments. But as Christians will not admit this with regard to the Bible, they have often no other resource, but either to wrest its words, or to change their own opinions. Which of these ways will be oftener taken, it is not difficult to say

§ 8. I HAVE often wished (if such a person could be found) that an infidel of sufficient learning,

penetration, coolness, and candour, would, merely for the sake of illustrating, what must be allowed, even by him, to be curious pieces of ancient literature, undertake the translation of the sacred books. Such a man would have no bias upon his mind to induce him to wrest the words, in order to make them speak his own sentiments. And, if he had the genuine spirit of the philosopher, historian, or antiquary, he would be solicitous to exhibit the manners, opinions, customs, and reasonings, of those early ages, fairly, as he found them, without adding any thing of his own, either to exalt, or to depress, the original. I should not think it impossible to find so much fairness in a Christian who, having resided long in India, and understood their sacred language, should undertake to translate to us the Scriptures of the Bramins; but such impartiality in an infidel living in a Christian country, would be, I fear, a chimerical expectation.

There is, however, I acknowledge, a considerable difference in the cases. We view with different eyes the opinions of remote ages and distant nations, from those wherewith we contemplate the sentiments of the times in which, and the people amongst whom, we live. The observation of our Lord¹⁰⁵ holds invariably, *He who is not for us, is against us; and he who gathereth not with us, scattereth.* We find no examples of neutrality in this cause. (Whoever is not a friend

¹⁰⁵ Matth. xii. 30.

is an enemy: and, for this reason, without any violation of charity, we may conclude that the interpretation of Scripture is safer in the hands of the bigoted sectary, than in those of the opinionative infidel, whose understanding is blinded by the most inflexible and the most unjust of all passions, an inveterate contempt. Hatred, when alone, may be prevailed on to inquire, and, in consequence of inquiry, may be surmounted; but when hatred is accompanied with contempt, it spurns inquiry as ridiculous.

§ 9. BUT, it may be said, though this may be justly applied to the confirmed infidel, it is not applicable to the sceptic who, because, on both sides of the question, he finds difficulties which he is not able to surmount, is perplexed with doubts in relation to it. I am sensible of the difference, and readily admit that what I said of the infidel, does not apply to the last mentioned character. At the same time I must observe, that those just now described, appear to be a very small number, and are not the people whom the world at present commonly calls *sceptics*. This on the contrary, like the term free-thinker, is become merely a softer and more fashionable name for *infidel*; for, on all those points wherein the sceptics of the age differ from Christians, they will be found, to the full, as dogmatical as the most tenacious of their adversaries¹⁰⁶. Such, at

¹⁰⁶ The only exception which has appeared in this age (if we can account one an exception who has done so much to

least, is the manner of those who, in modern Europe, affect to be considered as philosophical sceptics.

§ 10. BUT, to return to the consideration of the first printed editions, from which it may be thought I have digressed too far : what has been said sufficiently shows that they are not entitled to more credit than is due to the manuscripts from which they were compiled. Nobody ascribes

undermine in others a belief, with which at times he seems himself to have been strongly impressed) is that eminent but anomalous genius, Rousseau. He had the sensibility to feel strongly, if I may so express myself, the force of the internal evidence of our religion, resulting from the character, the life, and the death, of its Author, the purity and the sublimity of his instructions ; he had the sagacity to discern, and the candour to acknowledge, that the methods employed by infidels in accounting for these things are frivolous, and, to every rational inquirer, unsatisfactory. At the same time, through the unhappy influence of philosophical prejudices, insensible of the force of the external evidence of prophecy and miracles, he did not scruple to treat every plea of this kind as absurd, employing against the same religion, even the poorest cavils that are any where to be found in the writings of infidels. Nay, for this purpose, he mustered up a world of objections, without ever discovering that he mistook the subject of dispute, and confounded the doctrine of particular sects or denominations of Christians, with the doctrine of Christ. The articles against which his artillery is generally pointed, are the comments of later ages, and not the pure dictates of holy writ. See the character of this extraordinary man (whom I here consider only as a sceptic) as delineated by the masterly pen of Dr. Beattie. Essay on Truth, Part III. chap. 2.

inspiration, or any supernatural direction, to the first editors. And as to advantages merely natural, they were not on an equal footing with the critics of after-times. The most valuable manuscripts, far from being then generally known, remained scattered throughout the world. A few might fall under the notice of one curious inquirer, another few under that of another. But there had not been any number of them yet collated, and consequently their various readings had not been collected and published. Nay, that the judgment of those editors, concerning the antiquity and correctness of the manuscripts which they used, cannot be implicitly relied on, may warrantably be concluded from this circumstance, that this species of criticism was but in its infancy, and that even learned men had not then, as now, the necessary means of qualifying themselves, for judging of the antiquity, and correctness, of manuscripts. Besides, those publishers themselves were not unanimous. Nor were the alterations made by those of them who were posterior in time, always for the better. "I am amazed," says Michaelis¹⁰⁷, very justly, "when I hear some vindicate our common readings, as if the editors had been inspired by the Holy Ghost."

Is it possible, then, to assign a satisfactory reason for the determination of Bengelius, not to admit any reading which had not the support of some former printed edition? "Ne syllabam

¹⁰⁷ Introduc. Lect. sect. 34.

“quidem, etiamsi mille MSS. mille critici jubere-
“rent, antehac [in editionibus] non receptam,
“adducar ut recipiam¹⁰⁸.” He has not indeed confined himself, in his choice of readings, to any one edition, but has excluded entirely from his text, those readings which, however well supported, no preceding editor had adopted. This rule which he laid down to himself, is manifestly indefensible, inasmuch as the authority of the printed editions must ultimately rest on that of the manuscripts from which they are taken. Whereas it can give no additional value to the manuscripts, that some of the first publishers have thought fit to prefer them, perhaps injudiciously, to others; or, to speak more properly, have thought fit to copy them as the best they had. Their merit depends entirely on the evidences we have of their own antiquity, accuracy, &c. For none, surely, will be hardy enough to say, that errors, by being printed, will be converted into truths.

§ 11. THE only cause which I can assign, for the resolution taken by Bengelius, though of no weight in the scales of criticism and philosophy, may merit some regard, viewed in a prudential and political light. The printed copies are in every body's hands; the manuscripts are known to very few: and though the easy multiplication of the copies, by the press, will not be considered, by any person who reflects, as adding any authority to the manuscripts from which they were

¹⁰⁸ Prodrömus.

taken ; it has, nevertheless, the same effect on the generality of mankind, as if it did. Custom, the duration, and the extent, of their reception, are powerful supports, with the majority of readers. The reason, therefore, which has influenced that learned editor is, at bottom, I suppose, the same that influenced Jerom, when revising the old Latin version, not to correct every thing which he was sensible stood in need of correction, that he might not, by the number and boldness of his alterations, scandalize the people. But this is a motive of a kind totally different from those which arise from critical considerations, and ought not to be confounded with them.

§ 12. I do not mean to say, that this is a motive to which no regard should be shown. There are two cases in which, in my opinion, it ought to determine the preference ; first, when the arguments in favour of one reading, appear exactly balanced by those in favour of another ; secondly, when the difference in reading, cannot be said to affect either the sense, or the perspicuity, of the sentence. In the former case, when no better rule of decision can be discovered, it is but reasonable, that custom should be allowed to decide. In the latter, as we ought to avoid, especially in a version, introducing alterations of no significance, it might be justly accounted trifling, to take notice of such differences. In other cases, we ought to be determined by the rules of criticism ; that is, in other words, by the evidence impartially examined. As to which, I

shall only add, that though much regard is due to the number of manuscripts, editions, versions, &c. yet, in ascertaining the preference, we ought not to be determined solely by the circumstance of number. The testimony of a few credible witnesses, outweighs that of many who are of doubtful character. Besides, there are generally internal marks of credibility or incredibility, in the thing testified, which ought always to have some influence on the decision.

§ 13. AT the same time, I cannot help disapproving the admission of any correction (where the expression, as it stands in the text, is not downright nonsense) merely on conjecture: for, were such a method of correcting to be generally adopted, no bounds could be set to the freedom which would be used with sacred writ. We should very soon see it a perfect Babel in language, as various in its style, in different editions, as are the dialects of our different sects and parties. This is an extreme which, if it should prevail, would be of much more pernicious consequence than the other extreme, of adhering implicitly and inflexibly, with or without reason, to whatever we find in the common edition. We know the worst of this error already; and we can say, with assurance, that though the common editions are not perfect, there is no mistake in them of such a nature, as materially to affect, either the doctrines to be believed, or the duties to be practised, by a Christian. The worst consequences which the blunders of transcribers have occasioned, are their

hurting sometimes the perspicuity, sometimes the credibility, of holy writ, affording a handle to the objections of infidels, and thereby weakening the evidences of religion. But, as to the extreme of correcting on mere conjecture, its tendency is manifestly to throw every thing loose, and to leave all at the mercy of system-builders, and framers of hypotheses: for who shall give law to the licentiousness of guessing?

It is not enough to answer, that the classics have sometimes been corrected on conjecture. The cases are not parallel. A freedom may be taken with the latter with approbation, which cannot, with propriety, be taken with the former¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁹ Part I. § 21. Since these Dissertations were written, I have seen Dr. Geddes' PROSPECTUS, wherein, among many things which I entirely approve, I observed the following words (p. 55.) which appear to stand in direct contradiction to the opinion given above: "When the corruptions of the text cannot be removed, either by the collation of manuscripts, or the aid of versions, internal analogy, or external testimony, the last resource is conjectural criticism." In opposition to this doctrine, he produces a popular objection, which he examines and answers. And, in this answer, he goes still further, affirming that there are cases in which the text may be restored by *mere critical conjecture*. I have attentively considered his answer, and am led by it to regret that, through the imperfection of all languages, ancient and modern, it often happens that writers agree in sentiments who differ in words, and agree in words who differ in sentiments. Though that author and I have, on this head, expressed ourselves very

Houbigant, though a critic of eminence in Oriental literature, and a good translator, has, in my judg-

differently, I am apt to conclude, from the explanation he has given, the instances he has produced, and the canons he has laid down, that the difference between us is mostly, if not entirely, verbal. It lies chiefly in the sense affixed to the word *conjecture*. He has applied it to cases to which I should not think it applicable. When any passage contains in itself such indications, as are always accounted sufficient evidence of a particular alteration it has undergone, I never call the discovery of that alteration conjecture.

Now this is precisely the case in some of the instances given by Dr. Geddes. When, in one edition of the English Bible, we read *to ad daffliction to my bonds*, how do we reason from it? We perceive at once that *ad* is not English, neither is *daffliction*. Hence we conclude, with perfect assurance, that this is not the true reading, or the reading intended by the translators. A very little attention shows us that if, without altering the order of the letters, we take the *d* from the beginning of *daffliction*, and annex it to *ad* immediately preceding (which is the smallest alteration possible, as not a single letter intervenes) the expression is just in itself, and the meaning is suited to the context. As it stands, it is nonsense. No evidence can be more convincing. We may venture to say, that if there were fifty other editions of the English Bible at hand, no reasonable person would think of consulting any of them, for further satisfaction. Now I submit it to this critic himself, whether to say of any thing, "It is a matter of the utmost certainty," and to say, "It is a mere conjecture," be not considered as rather opposite in signification than coincident. There are some other of the learned Gentleman's examples, in which there is hardly more scope for conjecture than in that now examined: such as that wherein *terited* (which is no word) is used for *retired* (a word remarkably similar,) and that wherein *well* (which in that place has no meaning) is used

ment, taken most unjustifiable liberties in his conjectural emendations, and has been but too much

for *dwell*. In all such cases we are determined, by the internal evidence resulting from the similarity of the letters, from the scope of the place, and from the construction of the words. In a few of the cases put, there is, I own, something of conjecture; but the correction is not merely conjectural. Of this kind is that, *versed in the politer of learning*, where *parts* or *branches*, or some word of like signification, must be supplied. If it be asked, What then ought to be denominated a matter of mere conjecture? I answer, The reader will find an example of this in § 14. to which I refer him. We have but too many examples in some late critical productions of great name, wherein the authors, without any warrant from manuscripts or versions, and without any reason from the scope of the place, or the import of the passage, are perpetually proposing emendations on the text, and that by transposing, changing, adding, or dismissing, not only words but clauses, when the passage does not, as it stands, perfectly suit their notions.

That the text has sometimes been interpolated, and otherwise corrupted by transcribers and interpreters, cannot be questioned. Of this it is doubtless the critic's business to clear it as much as possible. But we ought ever to remember that the greater part of those corruptions were originally no other than conjectural corrections. And if we go to work in the same way, with such freedom of guessing as has sometimes been employed, it is ten to one that we ourselves corrupt the text instead of mending it, and that we serve only to furnish more work for future critics. I observe in the Monthly Review [August 1786] of Reed's late edition of Shakespeare, in a note on the expression *knowledge illinhabited*, which has given great plague to the critics, the following remark, "At all events we beg leave to enter our protest against putting *inhibit* into the text. How many plausible conjectures, which

followed by critics, commentators, or paraphrasts, amongst ourselves. I am far from thinking that, in some of his guesses, he may not be right; it is, however, much more probable that, in the greater part of them, he is wrong.

A mere conjecture may be mentioned in a note; but if, without the authority of copies, translations, or ancient ecclesiastical writers, it may be admitted into the text, there is an end of all reliance on the Scriptures as the dictates of the divine Spirit. Manuscripts, ancient translations, the readings of the most early commentators, are, like the witnesses in a judicial process, direct evidence in this matter. The reasonings of conjecturers are but like the speeches of the pleaders. To receive, on the credit of a sagacious conjecture, a reading not absolutely necessary to the construction, and quite unsupported by positive evidence, appears not less incongruous, than it would be, in a trial, to return a verdict, founded on the plead-

“ their ill-advised predecessors,” former publishers, “ had advanced into the body of the page, have the late editors, in consequence of their more extensive researches, been obliged to degrade to their proper place, the margin? Can they then be too scrupulous in admitting their own corrections?” Upon the whole, from the way wherein Dr. Geddes qualifies his sentiments, I am convinced, that the difference between him and me on this article is more in the words than in the thought. His verdict in regard to every one of the particular cases, supposed by him, is unexceptionable: but his manner of expressing the general position is, in my opinion, unguarded, and consequently may mislead.

ing of a plausible speaker, not only without proof, but in direct opposition to it. For, let it be observed, that the copies, ancient versions, and quotations, which are conformable to the common reading, are positive evidence in its favour, and therefore against the conjecture. And even, if the readings of the passage be various, there is, though less, still some weight in their evidence against a reading merely conjectural, and consequently, destitute of external support, and different from them all. It must, however, be acknowledged, that the variety itself, if it affect some of the oldest manuscripts and translations, is a presumption that the place has been early corrupted in transcribing.

§ 14. I CANNOT avoid, here, taking notice of a correction, merely conjectural, proposed by the late Dr. Kennicott, a man to whose pious and useful labours, the learned in general, and the students of the divine oracles in particular, are under the greatest obligations. The correction he proposes ¹¹⁰, is on these words, קברו זאת עשיר במתיו, ויתן תא רשעים. E. T. *And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death* ¹¹¹. This ingenious critic supposes, that the words קברו and במתיו have, by some means or other, changed places. He would have them, therefore, transposed, or rather restored, each to its proper place, in consequence of which, the import will

¹¹⁰ Diss. II, chap. IV. 2d period.

¹¹¹ Isa. liii. 9.

be (I give it in his own words,) *And he was taken up with wicked men in his death; and with a rich man was his sepulchre.* He adds: "Since the preceding parts of the prophecy speak so indisputably of the sufferings and death of the Messiah, these words seem evidently meant, as descriptive of the Messiah's being put to death in company with wicked men, and making his grave, or sepulchre (not with rich men, but) with one rich man."

Now, let it be observed, that of all the vast number of manuscripts which that gentleman had collated, not one was found to favour this arrangement; that neither the Septuagint, nor any other old translation, is conformable to it; that no ancient author, known to us, in any language, quotes the words, so arranged, either from the original, or from any version; and, consequently, that we cannot consider the conjecture otherwise, than as opposed by such a cloud of witnesses as, in inquiries of this kind, must be accounted strong positive evidence. Had the words, as they are read in Scripture, been ungrammatical, so as to yield no meaning that we could discover, and had the transposition of the two words added both sense and grammar to the sentence, and that in perfect consistency with the scope of the context, I should have readily admitted, that the criticism stood on a firmer foundation than mere conjecture, and that the external proofs, from testimony, might be counterbalanced by the intrinsic evidence arising from the subject. But this is not

pretended here. To be associated with the rich in death, is equally grammatical, and equally intelligible, as to be associated with the wicked; the like may be said in regard to burial. Where, then, is the occasion for a change? The only answer that can be given, is certainly a very bad one. The occasion is, that the words may be adjusted to an event which, in our opinion, is the fulfilment of the prophecy.

But, if such liberties may be taken with the Prophets, there will be no difficulty in obtaining, from them, proofs in support of any interpretation. The learned Doctor takes notice, that the preceding part of this chapter speaks indisputably of the sufferings and death of the Messiah. I am as much convinced as any man, that the subject of the prophecy is as he represents it; but, to say that it is indisputably so, seems to insinuate that it is universally admitted. Now this is far from being the fact. It is disputed by the whole Jewish nation, and is allowed by some Christian expositors, to be only, in a secondary sense, prophetic of Christ. Suppose a Christian, after the passage shall have been, in the Christian Bibles, new modelled in the way proposed, to urge it on a Jew, as an argument from prophecy, that Jesus, the son of Mary, is the person in whom the prediction was fulfilled, and therefore the Messiah; inasmuch as the words exactly represent what, in so signal a manner, happened to him.—He suffered with malefactors, and was buried in a rich man's sepulchre; would not the other have reason to retort, 'Ye Christians have a wonderful dexterity

‘ in managing the argument from prophecy ; ye,
‘ first, by changing and transposing the Prophet’s
‘ words, accommodating them to your purpose,
‘ make him say, what we have direct evidence
‘ that he never said ; and then ye have the confi-
‘ dence to argue, this must infallibly be the event
‘ intended by the Prophet, it so exactly answers
‘ the description. Ye yourselves make the prophe-
‘ cy resemble the event which ye would have to
‘ be predicted by it, and then ye reason, from the
‘ resemblance, that this is the completion of the
‘ prophecy.’

Let us judge equitably of men of all denomina-
tions. Should we discover that the Masorets had
made so free with the declaration of any Prophet,
in order to adapt it to what they take to be the
accomplishment ; would we hesitate a moment to
call the words, so metamorphosed, a corruption of
the sacred text ? In an enlightened age, to recur
to such expedients, will be always found to hurt
true religion, instead of promoting it. The detec-
tion of them, in a few instances, brings a suspicion
on the cause they were intended to serve, and
would go far to discredit the argument from
prophecy altogether. I cannot conclude this re-
mark, without adding, that this is almost the only
instance wherein I differ in critical sentiments
from that excellent author ; from whose labours, I
acknowledge with gratitude, I have reaped much
pleasure and instruction.

§ 15. To conclude what relates to various read-
ings ; those variations, which do not affect either

the sense or the connection, I take no notice of; because the much greater part of them would occasion no difference in translating; and even of the few of these which might admit some difference, the difference is more in words than in meaning. Again, such variations as even alter the sense, but are not tolerably supported, by either external, or internal, evidence, especially when the common reading has nothing in it apparently irrational, or unsuitable to the context, I have not judged necessary to mention. Those, on the contrary, which not only, in some degree, affect the sense, but, from their own intrinsic evidence, or from the respectable support of manuscripts and versions, have divided the critics about their authenticity, I have taken care to specify. When the evidence, in their favour, appeared to me clearly to preponderate, I have admitted them into the text, and assigned my reason in the notes. Wherever the matter seemed dubious, I have preferred the common reading, and suggested, in the notes, what may be advanced in favour of the other. When the difference lay in the rejection of a clause commonly received, though the probability were against its admission, yet, if the sentence or clause were remarkable, and if it neither conveyed a sentiment unsuitable to the general scope, nor brought obscurity on the context, I have judged it better to retain it, than to shock many readers by the dismissal of what they have been accustomed to read in their Bible. At the same time, to distinguish such clauses, as of doubt-

ful authority, I inclose them in crotchets. Of this the doxology, as it is called, in the Lord's prayer, is an example. In other cases, I have not scrupled to omit what did not appear sufficiently supported.

$$\sqrt{\frac{56}{33}}$$

PART III.

THE DIALECT EMPLOYED.

As to what concerns the language of this version, I have not much to add to the explanations I have given of my sentiments on this article, in the latter part of the preceding Dissertation, and the first part of the present. When the common translation was made, and (which is still earlier) when the English liturgy was composed, the reigning dialect was not entirely the same with that which prevails at present. Now, as the dialect which then obtained does, very rarely, even to the readers of this age, either injure the sense, or affect the perspicuity; I have judged it proper, in a great measure, to retain it. The differences are neither great, nor numerous. The third person singular of the present of the verb, terminates in the syllable *eth*, in the old dialect, not the letter *s*, as in that now current. The participles are very rarely contracted; nor is there ever any elision of

the vowels. Indeed, these elisions, though not entirely laid aside, are becoming much less frequent now, than they were about the beginning of the last century. The difference is, in itself, inconsiderable: yet, as all ranks and denominations of Christians are, from the use of, either the Bible, or the Book of Common Prayer, or both, habituated to this dialect; and as it has contracted a dignity, favourable to seriousness, from its appropriation to sacred purposes; it is, I think, in a version of any part of holy writ, entitled to be preferred to the modern dialect.

§ 2. THE gayer part of mankind will, doubtless, think that there is more vivacity in our common speech; as by retrenching a few unnecessary vowels, the expression is shortened, and the sentiment conveyed with greater quickness. But vivacity is not the character of the language of the sacred penmen. Gravity here, or even solemnity, if not carried to excess, is much more suitable. I bid “this man,” says the centurion, in the anonymous translation ¹¹², “Go, and he’s gone; another, Come, and he’s here; and to my servant, Do this, and it is done.” And in the parallel place in Luke ¹¹³, “Lord, don’t give yourself the trouble of coming; I don’t deserve you should honour my house with your presence.” There are, I believe, not a few who would prefer this manner to that of the common version, as being much smarter, as well

¹¹² Matth. viii. 9.

¹¹³ Luke, vii. 6.

as more genteel. Surely, if that interpreter had given the smallest attention to uniformity, he would never have rendered *αμην αμην λεγω υμιν*, as he sometimes does, by the antiquated phrase, *Verily, verily I say unto you*. It would have been but of a piece with many passages of his version, to employ the more modish, and more gentlemanlike asseveration, "Upon my honour." With those who can relish things sacred in this dress, or rather disguise, I should think it in vain to dispute.

§ 3. ANOTHER criterion of that solemn dialect, is the recourse, when an individual is addressed, to the singular number of the second personal pronoun *thou* and *thee*, and, consequently, to the second person singular of the verb, which being, in common language, supplied by the plural *is*, in a manner, obsolete. This also is, from scriptural use, and the constant use of it in worship, in the British dominions, both by those of the establishment, and by dissenters, universally intelligible, and now considered as the proper dialect of religion. Immediately after the Reformation, the like mode, in using the pronoun, was adopted by all Protestant translators into French, Italian, and German, as well as into English. But as, in Roman Catholic countries, those translations were of no authority; and as the Scriptures are read in their churches, and their devotions and ceremonies performed, in a language not understood by the people; the customs of dissenters, as all Protestants are in those countries, could not introduce,

into the language of religion, so great a singularity of idiom. And as there was nothing to recommend this manner to the people, whilst there were several things to prejudice them against it, we do not find that it has been employed by any late Popish translators into French.

What tended to prejudice them against it, is, first, the general disuse of it in the ordinary intercourse of men; and, secondly, the consideration that the few exceptions from this disuse, in common life, instead of showing respect or reverence, suggests always either pity or contempt; no person being ever addressed in this way but one greatly inferior, or a child. This being the case, and they not having, like us, a solemn, to counterbalance the familiar, use; the practice of Protestants would rather increase, than diminish, their dislike of it. For these reasons, the use of the singular pronoun, in adoration, has the same effect, nearly, on them, which the contrary use of the plural has on us. To a French Catholic, *Tu es notre Dieu, et nous te benirons*, and to an English Protestant, *You are our God, and we will bless you*, equally betray an indecent familiarity¹¹⁴. By reason of this difference in the prevailing usages,

¹¹⁴ The way in which *Saci*, who appears to have been a pious worthy man, translates from the Vulgate the Lord's Prayer, rendered literally from French into English, is a striking example of the difference of manner: "Our Father
" who are in heaven, let your name be sanctified, let your
" reign arrive, let your will be done," &c. Yet the earlier

it must be acknowledged, that French Romanists have a plausible pretext for using the plural. We have, however, a real advantage in our manner, especially in worship. Theirs, it is true, in consequence of the prevalent use, has nothing in it disrespectful or indecent; but this is merely a negative commendation; ours, on account of the peculiarity of its appropriation in religious subjects, is eminently serious and affecting. It has, besides, more precision. In worship, it is a more explicit declaration of the unity of the Godhead; and even when, in holy writ, addressed to a creature, it serves to remove at least one ambiguous circumstance, consequent on modern use, which does not rightly distinguish what is said to one, from what is said to many. And though the scope

Popish translators chose to use the singular number as well as the reformed. It had been the universal practice of the ancients, Greeks, Romans, and Orientals. It was used in the English translation of Rheims, though composed by Papists in opposition to the Protestant version then commonly received. In the later versions of French Protestants, this use of the singular number of the second person is given up entirely, except in addresses to God; the formularies read in their meetings, having, in this particular, established among them a different usage. Beausobre and Lenfant [see *Preface Generale sur le Nouveau Testament*] strenuously maintain the propriety of their not using the singular of the second personal pronoun except in worship. I admit their arguments to be conclusive with respect to French; but, for the reasons above mentioned, they are inconclusive applied to English. Yet in this some English translators have followed the French manner, but not uniformly.

of the place often shows the distinction, it does not always.

§ 4. A FEW other particulars of the ancient dialect I have also retained, especially in those instances wherein, without hurting perspicuity, they appeared to give greater precision: but those, on the contrary, which might, in some instances, darken the expression, or render it equivocal, I have rejected altogether. For I consider no quality of elocution as more essential than perspicuity, and nothing more conducive to this, than as much uniformity and precision in the application of words, as the language will admit. For this reason, though I have retained *whether* for which of two, *whoso* for whoever, and a few others, little used at present; I have not employed *which*, as in the old dialect, for who, or whom, *his* or *her* for its, *that* for that which, or what. For these, though they do not often occasion ambiguity, sometimes occasion it: and there is no way of preventing doubt in every case, but by observing uniformity, when practicable, in all cases. In such an expression, for example, as that of the Apostle Peter¹¹⁵, *Being born again by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*; if the relative *which* were applied, indiscriminately, to persons or to things, it might be questioned, whether what is affirmed, be affirmed of the word of God, or of God himself. But if,

¹¹⁵ 1 Pet. i. 23.

according to present use, it be confined to things, there is no question at all.

§ 5. ANOTHER point, in which the scriptural differs from the modern dialect, is in the manner sometimes used in expressing the future. In all predictions, prophecies, or authoritative declarations, the auxiliary *shall* is used, where, in common language, it would now be *will*. This method, as adding weight to what is said, I always adopt, unless when it is liable to be equivocally interpreted, and seems to represent moral agents as acting through necessity, or by compulsion. In the graver sorts of poetry, the same use is made of the auxiliary *shall*. As to the prepositions, I observed, in the preceding Dissertation¹¹⁶, that the present use gives them more precision, and so occasions fewer ambiguities, than the use which prevailed formerly. I have, therefore, given it the preference. There is one case, however, wherein I always observe the old method. *Called of God, chosen of God*, and other the like phrases, are, for an obvious reason, more agreeable to Christian ears, than if we were to prefix to the name of God the preposition *by*. The pronouns *mine* and *thine*, I have also sometimes, after the ancient manner, in order to avoid a disagreeable hiatus, substituted for *my* and *thy*.

§ 6. To the foregoing remarks on the subject of dialect, I shall subjoin a few things on the

manner of rendering proper names. Upon the revival of letters in the West, Pagnin first, and after him some other translators, through an affectation of accuracy in things of no moment, so justly censured by Jerom, seem to have considered it as a vast improvement, to convey, as nearly as possible, in the letters of another language, the very sounds of the Hebrew and Syriac names which occur in Scripture. Hence the names of some of the most eminent personages in the Old Testament, were, by this new dialect, so much metamorphosed, that those who were accustomed to the ancient translation, could not, at first hearing, recognize the persons with whose history they had been long acquainted. The *Heva* of the Vulgate was transformed into *Chauwa*, the *Isaia* into *Jesahiahu*, the *Jeremia* into *Irmeiahu*, the *Ezechiel* into *Jechezechel*, and similar changes were made on many others. In this Pagnin soon had, if not followers, at least imitators. The trifling innovations made by him, after his manner, have served as an example to others to innovate also after theirs. Junius and Tremellius, though they say, with Pagnin, *Chauwa*, do not adopt his *Jesahiahu*, *Irmeiahu*, and *Jechezechel*; but they give us what is no better of their own, *Jischahja*, *Jirmeja*, and *Jechezekel*. Munster's deviations are less considerable, and Castalio went no further (except in transforming the name of God into *Javo*,) than to give a Latin termination to the names formerly used, that he might thereby render them declinable.

§ 7. A DEVIATION purely of this last kind, as it served to prevent ambiguities, otherwise inevitable, in the Latin, where there was no ambiguity in the original, did, in my opinion, admit a good apology. For, what was expressed in Hebrew, by the aid of the *status constructus*, as their grammarians call it, or by prepositions, was expressed with equal clearness, in Latin, by means of declension : whereas, by making the names indeclinable, in this language, that advantage had been lost, in regard to many names ; and ambiguities, of which there was not a trace in the original, introduced into the translation. The declension of proper names was not, however, equally essential to perspicuity in Greek as in Latin. Their want of cases, the Greeks could supply by the cases of the article, which the idiom of their tongue permitted them to prefix. But the Latins had no article. It was, therefore, very injudicious, in the first Latin translators to imitate the Seventy in this particular ; the more so, as it had been the common practice of Latin authors, to decline the foreign names they adopted, in order the more effectually to fit them for use in their tongue. Thus they said, *Hannibal Hannibalis*, *Juba Jubaæ*, and *Hanno Hannonis*. The inconveniences of the other manner appear from many equivocal passages in the Vulgate, which, without some previous knowledge of the subject, it would be difficult to understand¹¹⁷. Castalio, in like manner, intro-

¹¹⁷ Several instances occur in the prophetic benediction which Moses gave to the twelve tribes, immediately before his

duced into his version patronymics formed on the Grecian model, as *Jacobida* and *Davidides*, in which, as he has not been followed, we may conclude that he is generally condemned; and, in my opinion, not undeservedly, because the departure from the Hebrew idiom, in this instance, is both unnecessary and affected.

§ 8. BUT, though it be excusable to alter the names in common use, so far as to make them admit inflections in languages which use inflections, since this alteration answers a necessary purpose; to alter them, for the sake of bringing them nearer the ancient orthography, or for the sake of assisting us to produce a sound in pronouncing them, that may resemble the sound of the ancient names, is no better than arrant pedantry. The use of proper names is, as that of appellatives, to serve as signs, for recalling to the mind what is signified by them. When this purpose is attained, their end is answered. Now, as it is use alone which can convert a sound into a sign, a

death, Deut. xxxiii. In verse 4. *Legem præcipit nobis Moyses, hæreditatem multitudinis Jacob.* To one unacquainted with Scripture, it would not be obvious that *Moses* here is in the nominative, and *Jacob* in the genitive. Hardly could it be suspected, that in the following verses, 8. *Levi quoque ait*; 12. *Et Benjamin ait* (and so of the rest,) the names are in the dative. The form of the expression in Latin could not fail to lead an ordinary reader to understand them as in the nominative. Yet nothing can be more unequivocal than the words in Hebrew.

word that has been long used (whether a proper name or an appellative) as the sign of person or thing, genus, species, or individual, must be preferable to a new invented, and therefore unauthorized sound. If there is generally in proper names a greater resemblance to the original words than in appellatives, this difference nowise affects the argument. Appellatives are the signs of species and genera, with the more considerable part of which the people are acquainted in all civilized countries. Common things have consequently names in all languages; and the names in one language have often no affinity to those in another. Proper names are the signs of individuals, known originally only in the neighbourhood of the place of their existence, whence the name is transferred with the knowledge of the individual into other languages.

But the introduction of the name is not because of any peculiar propriety in the sound for signifying what is meant by it; but merely because, when the language we write does not supply a suitable term, this is the easiest and most natural expedient. It is in this way also we often provide appellatives, when the thing spoken of, which sometimes happens, has no name in our native idiom. But when an individual thing is of a nature to be universally known, and to have a name in every language, as the sun, the moon, and the earth, we never, in translating from an ancient tongue, think of adopting the name we find there, but always give our own. Yet the things now mentioned are

as really individuals, as are Peter, James, and John. And when, in the case of appellatives, we have been obliged at first to recur for a name, to the language whence we drew our knowledge of the thing, we never think afterwards of reforming the term, because not so closely formed on the original, as it might have been. It has, by its currency, produced that association which confers on it the power of a sign, and this is all that the original term itself ever had, or could have. Who would think of reforming flail into *flagel*, messenger into *messenger*, and nurse into *nourrice*, that they may be nearer, the first to the Latin, or perhaps the German, and the second and third to the French originals?

§ 9. BESIDES, in translating Hebrew names, the attempt was the more vain, as little or nothing was known about their pronunciation. The manner of pronouncing the consonants is judged of very differently by the critics; and as to the vowels, who has not heard what contests they have occasioned among the learned? But what rendered this attempt, at giving the exact pronunciation, completely ridiculous, is, that it was made in Latin, a dead language, of whose pronunciation also we have no standard, and in the speaking or reading of which, every different nation follows a different rule. Harmony among themselves, therefore, was not to be expected in men who had taken this whim. Accordingly, when they once began to innovate, every one innovated after his own fashion, and had a list of names peculiar to

himself. This, with reasonable people, has sufficiently exposed the folly of the conceit.

§ 10. Now, though our translators have not made the violent stretches made by Pagnin and others, for the sake of adjusting the names to the original sounds, and have not distressed our organs of speech with a collision of letters hardly utterable; there is one article on which I do not think them entirely without blame. The names of the same persons, and in effect the same names, are sometimes rendered differently by them in the New Testament, from what they had been rendered in the Old; and that, on account of a very considerable difference in the spelling, or perhaps only in the termination in Hebrew and in Greek. By this the sense has been injured to ordinary readers, who are more generally ignorant than we are apt to imagine, of the persons in the Old Testament, meant by the names in the New. Now this is a species of *κακοζηλια*, from which the authors of the Vulgate were free.

The old Italic had been made from the Greek of the Seventy. The names by consequence were more accommodated to the Greek orthography than to the Hebrew. But as that was a matter of no consequence, when Jerom undertook to translate from the Hebrew, he did not think it expedient to make any changes in the proper names to which the people had been habituated from their infancy. He knew that this might have led some readers into mistakes, and, as appearing

awkward and affected, would be disagreeable to others: at the same time there was no conceivable advantage from it to compensate these inconveniences. For, to tell the Latin reader more exactly how the Hebrew proper names sounded (if that could have been done,) was of no more significance to him, than to acquaint him with the sound of their appellatives. He therefore judged rightly, in preserving in the Old Testament, though he translated from the Hebrew, the names to which the people were accustomed, as *Elias*, and *Eliseus*, and *Esdras*, and *Nebuchodonosor*, which were formed immediately from the Greek. By this means there was an uniformity in the manner of translating both Testaments. The prophets, and other eminent ancients, were not distinguished by one name in one part of the sacred text, and by another in the other. Whereas the attempt at tracing servilely the letter in each part, has given us two sets of names for the same persons, of which the inconveniences are glaring, but the advantages invisible.

§ 11. IT may be thought indeed a matter of little consequence, and that the names, if not the same, do at least so closely resemble, that they can hardly be mistaken for the names of different persons. But I have had occasion to discover that many of the unlearned, though neither ignorant nor deficient in understanding, know not that *Elias*, so often mentioned in the New Testament, is the *Elijah* of the Old, that *Eliseus* is *Elisha*, that *Osee* is *Hosea*, and that the *Jesus*,

mentioned once in the Acts ¹¹⁸, and once in the Epistle to the Hebrews ¹¹⁹, is Joshua. Had the names been totally different in the original, there might have been some reason for adopting this method. The old Oriental names are often of use for pointing out the founders of nations, families, and tribes, and the more recent Greek names serve to connect those early notices with the later accounts of Greek and Roman historians. If they had, therefore, in the translation of the Old Testament, given, as in the original, the name *Mizraim* to Egypt, *Aram* to Syria, and *Javan* to Greece, much might have been urged in defence of this manner. But when all the difference in the words results from an insignificant alteration in the spelling, in order to accommodate the Hebrew name to Grecian ears; to consider them on that account as different names, and translate them differently, does not appear susceptible of a rational apology.

What should we think of a translator of Polybius, for example, who should always call Carthage *Karchedon*, and Hannibal *Annibas*, because the words of his author are *Καρχηδών* and *Αννίβας*, or, to come nearer home, should, in translating into English from the French, call London *Londres*, and the Hague *La Haye*. It can be ascribed solely to the almost irresistible influence of example, that our translators, who were eminent for their discernment as well as their learning, have been drawn into this frivolous innovation. At the

¹¹⁸ Acts, vii. 45.

¹¹⁹ Heb. iv. 8.

now refutation (1851)

same time their want of uniformity, in using this method, seems to betray a consciousness of some impropriety in it, and that it tended unnecessarily to darken what in itself is perfectly clear. Accordingly, they have not thought it advisable to exhibit the names in the most frequent use, differently in different parts of Scripture, or even differently from the names by which the persons are known in profane history. Thus he whom they have called Moses in the New Testament, is not in the Old Testament made *Mosheh*, nor Solomon *Shelomeh*; nor is Artaxerxes rendered *Artachshasta*, nor Cyrus *Choresch*, agreeably to the Hebrew orthography, though the names of the two last mentioned, are not derived to us from the New Testament, but from pagan historians.

§ 12. NOT that I think it of any moment whether the names be derived from the Greek, or from the Hebrew, or from any other language. The matters of consequence here are only these two. First, to take the name in the most current use, whether it be formed from the Hebrew, from the Greek, or from the Latin; secondly, to use the same name in both Testaments, when the difference made on it, in the two languages, is merely such a change in the spelling and termination, as commonly takes place in transplanting a word from one tongue into another. Nothing can be more vain than the attempt to bring us, in pronouncing names, to a stronger resemblance to the original sounds. Were this, as it is not, an object

deserving the attention of an interpreter, it were easy to show that the methods employed for this purpose have often had the contrary effect. We have in this mostly followed German and Dutch linguists.

Admitting that they came near the truth, according to their rule of pronouncing, which is the utmost they can ask, the powers of the same nominal letters are different in the different languages spoken at present in Europe; and we, by following their spelling, even when they were in the right, have departed farther from the original sound than we were before. The consonant *j*, sounds in German like our *y* in the word *year*, *sch* with them sounds like our *sh*, like the French *ch*, and like the Italian *sc*, when it immediately precedes *i* or *e*; whereas *sch* with us has generally the same sound with *sk*, and the consonant *j* the same with *g* before *i* or *e*. Besides, the letters which with us have different sounds in different situations, we have reason to believe, were sounded uniformly in ancient languages, or, at least, did not undergo alterations correspondent to ours. Thus the brook called *Kidron*, in the common version in the Old Testament, is, for the sake, I suppose, of a closer conformity to the Greek, called *Cedron* in the New. Yet the *c* in our language in this situation, is sounded exactly as the *s*, a sound which we have good ground to think that the corresponding letter in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin never had.

§ 13. THE rules, therefore, which I have followed in expressing proper names, are these: First, when the name of the same person or thing is, in the common translation, both in the Old Testament and in the New, expressed in the same manner, whether it be derived from the Hebrew, or from the Greek, I uniformly employ it, because in that case it has always the sanction of good use. Thus *Moses* and *Aaron*, *David* and *Solomon*, *Jerusalem* and *Jericho*, *Bethlehem* and *Jordan*, and many others, remain in the places of which they have had immemorial possession; though of these *Moses* and *Solomon* are directly from the Greek, the rest from the Hebrew. Secondly, when the name of the same person or thing is expressed, in the common translation, differently in the Old Testament and in the New (the difference being such as results from adapting words of one language to the articulation of another,) I have, except in a very few cases, preferred the word used in the Old Testament. This does not proceed from the desire of coming nearer the pronunciation of the Hebrew root: for that is a matter of no consequence; but from the desire of preventing, as far as possible, all mistakes in regard to the persons or things spoken of. It is from the Old Testament, that we have commonly what is known of the individuals mentioned in it, and referred to in the New. By naming them differently, there is a danger lest the person or thing alluded to be mistaken.

For this reason, I say, *Elijah*, not *Elias*; *Elisha*, not *Eliseus*; *Isaiah*, not *Esaias*; *Kidron*, not *Ce-*

dron. For this reason, also, in the catalogues of our Lord's progenitors, both in Matthew and in Luke, I have given the names, as they are spelt in the common version of the Old Testament. From this rule I admit some exceptions. In a few instances, the thing mentioned is better known, either by what is said of it in the New Testament, or by the information we derive from Pagan authors, than by what we find in the Old. In this case, the name, in the New Testament, has a greater currency than that used in the Old, and consequently, according to my notion of what ought to regulate our choice, is entitled to the preference. For this reason, I say *Sarepta* and *Sidon*, not *Zarephath* and *Zidon*; as the former names are rendered, by classical use, as well as that of the New Testament, more familiar than the latter. Thirdly, when the same name is given by the sacred writers, in their own language, to different persons, which the English translators have rendered differently in the different applications, I have judged it reasonable to adopt this distinction, made by our old interpreters, as conducing to perspicuity. The name of Jacob's fourth son is the same with that of two of the Apostles. But as the first rule obliges me to give the Old Testament name *Judah* to the Patriarch, I have reserved the term *Judas*, as used in the New, for the two Apostles. This also suits universal and present use: for we never call the Patriarch *Judas*, nor any of the Apostles *Judah*. The proper name of our Lord is the same with that of *Joshua*, who is, in the Septuagint, always called

Ἰησους, and is twice so named in the New Testament. Every body must be sensible of the expediency of confining the Old Testament name to the captain of the host of Israel, and the other to the Messiah. There can be no doubt, that the name of Aaron's sister, and that of our Lord's mother, were originally the same. The former is called, in the Septuagint, *Μαριαμ*, the name also given to the latter by the Evangelist Luke. The other Evangelists commonly say *Μαρια*. But as use, with us, has appropriated *Miriam* to the first, and *Mary* to the second, it could answer no valuable purpose to confound them. The name of the father of the twelve tribes is, in the Oriental dialects, the same with that of one of the sons of Zebedee, and that of the son of Alpheus. A small distinction is, indeed, made by the Evangelists, who add a Greek termination to the Hebrew name, when they apply it to the Apostles, which, when they apply it to the Patriarch, they never do. If our translators had copied as minutely, in this instance, as they have done in some others, the Patriarch, they would indeed have named *Jacob*, and each of the two Apostles *Jacobus*. However, as in naming the two last, they have thought fit to substitute *James*, which use also has confirmed, I have preserved this distinction.

§ 14. UPON the whole, in all that concerns proper names, I have conformed to the judicious rule of king James the first, more strictly, I suppose,

than those translators to whom it was recommended: "The names of the Prophets, and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, are to be retained, as near as may be, according as they are vulgarly used."

PART IV.

THE OUTWARD FORM OF THE VERSION.

I AM now to offer a few things on the form in which this translation is exhibited. It is well known, that the division of the books of holy writ, into chapters and verses, does not proceed from the inspired writers, but is a contrivance of a much later date. Even the punctuation, for distinguishing the sentences from one another, and dividing every sentence into its constituent members and clauses, though a more ancient invention, was, for many ages, except by grammarians and rhetoricians, hardly ever used in transcribing; insomuch, that whatever depends merely on the division of sentences, on points, aspirations, and accents, cannot be said to rest ultimately, as the words themselves do, upon the authority of the sacred penmen. These particulars give free scope for the sagacity of criticism, and unrestrained exercise to the talent of investigating;

inasmuch as in none of these points is there any ground for the plea of inspiration.

§ 2. As to the division into chapters and verses, we know that the present is not that which obtained in primitive ages, and that even the earliest division is not derived from the Apostles, but from some of their first commentators, who, for the conveniency of readers, contrived this method. The division into chapters, that now universally prevails in Europe, derived its origin from cardinal Caro, who lived in the twelfth century: the subdivision into verses is of no older date than the middle of the sixteenth century, and was the invention of Robert Stevens. That there are many advantages which result from so minute a partition of the sacred oracles, cannot be denied. The facility with which any place, in consequence of this method, is pointed out by the writer, and found by the reader, the easy recourse it gives, in consulting commentators, to the passage whereof the explanation is wanted, the aid it has afforded to the compilers of concordances, which are of considerable assistance in the study of Scripture; these, and many other accommodations, have accrued from this contrivance.

§ 3. It is not, however, without its inconveniences. This manner of mincing a connected work into short sentences, detached from one another, not barely in appearance, by their being ranked under separate numbers, and by the breaks in the lines, but in effect, by the influence

which the text, thus parcelled out, has insensibly had on copiers and translators, both in pointing, and in translating, is not well suited to the species of composition which obtains in all the sacred books, except the Psalms, and the Book of Proverbs. To the epistolary and argumentative style it is extremely ill adapted, as has been well evinced by Mr. Locke¹²⁰; neither does it suit the historical. There are inconveniences which would result from this way of dividing, even if executed in the best manner possible: but, though I am unwilling to detract from the merit of an expedient which has been productive of some good consequences, I cannot help observing that the inventors have been far too hasty in conducting the execution.

The subject is sometimes interrupted by the division into chapters. Of this I might produce many examples, but, for brevity's sake, shall mention only a few. The last verse of the fifteenth chapter of Matthew is much more closely connected with what follows in the sixteenth, than with what precedes. In like manner, the last verse of the nineteenth chapter, *Many shall be first that are last, and last that are first*, ought not to be disjoined, (I say not, from the subsequent chapter, but even) from the subsequent paragraph, which contains the parable of the labourers hired to work in the vineyard, brought merely in illustration of that sentiment, and beginning and end-

¹²⁰ *Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles*, prefixed to his paraphrase and notes on some of the Epistles.

ing with it. The first verse of the fifth chapter of Mark is much more properly joined to the concluding paragraph of the fourth chapter, as it shows the completeness of the miracle there related, than to what follows in the fifth. The like may be remarked of the first verse of the ninth chapter. Of the division into verses, it may be observed, that it often occasions an unnatural separation of the members of the same sentence¹²¹; nay, sometimes, which is worse, the same verse comprehends a part of two different sentences.

That this division should often have a bad effect upon translators is inevitable. First, by attending narrowly to the verses, an interpreter runs the risk of overlooking the right, and adopting a wrong, division of the sentences. Of this I shall give one remarkable example from the Gospel of John¹²². Our Lord says, in one of his discourses, *Εγω ειμι ὁ ποιμην ὁ καλος· και γινωσκω τα ἑμα, και γινωσκομαι ὑπο των εμων, καθως γινωσκει με ὁ πατηρ, καγω γινωσκω τον πατερα· και την ψυχην μου τιθημι ὑπερ των προβατων.* When the sentence is thus pointed, as it manifestly ought to be, and exhibited unbroken by the division into verses, no person can doubt that the following version is equally close to the letter and to the sense. *I am the good Shepherd; I both know my own, and am known by them, even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father; and I lay down*

¹²¹ In Matth. xi. 2. we have a verse without a verb, and ending with a comma.

¹²² John, x. 14, 15.

my life for the sheep. But its being divided into two sentences, and put into separate verses, has occasioned the disjointed and improper version given in the common translation. 14. *I am the good Shepherd and know my -sheep ; and am known of mine.* 15. *As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father : and I lay down my life for the sheep.* In this artificial distribution (which seems to have originated from Beza ; for he acknowledges that before him, the fifteenth verse included only the last member, *and I lay down, &c.*) the second sentence is an abrupt, and totally unconnected, interruption of what is affirmed in the preceding words, and in the following. Whereas, taking the words as they stand naturally, it is an illustration by similitude quite in our Lord's manner, of what he had affirmed in the foregoing words. But, though the translator should not be misled in this manner, a desire of preserving, in every verse of his translation, all that is found in the corresponding verse of his original, that he may adjust the one to the other, and give verse for verse, may oblige him to give the words a more unnatural arrangement, in his own language, than he would have thought of doing, if there had been no such division into verses, and he had been left to regulate himself solely by the sense.

§ 4. INFLUENCED by these considerations, I have determined, neither entirely to reject the common division, nor to adopt it in the manner which is usually done. To reject it entirely, would be to

give up one of the greatest conveniences we have in the use of any version, for every purpose of occasional consultation, and examination, as well as for comparing it with the original, and with other versions. Nor is it enough that a more commodious division than the present may be devised, which shall answer all the useful purposes of the common version, without its inconveniences. Still there are some advantages which a new division could not have, at least, for many centuries. The common division, such as it is, has prevailed universally, and does prevail, not in this kingdom only, but throughout all Christendom. Concordances in different languages, commentaries, versions, paraphrases; all theological works, critical, polemical, devotional, practical, in their order of commenting on Scripture, and in all their references to Scripture, regulate themselves by it. If we would not then have a new version rendered in a great measure useless, to those who read the old, or even the original, in the form wherein it is now invariably printed, or who have recourse to any of the helps above mentioned, we are constrained to adopt, in some shape or other, the old division.

§ 5. FOR these reasons, I have judged it necessary to retain it; but, at the same time, in order to avoid the disadvantages attending it, I have followed the method taken by some other editors, and confined it to the margin. This answers sufficiently all the purposes of reference and comparison,

without tending so directly to interrupt the reader, and divert him from perceiving the natural connection of the things treated. I have also adopted such a new division into sections and paragraphs, as appeared to me better suited than the former, both to the subject of these histories, and to the manner of treating it. Nothing, surely, can be more incongruous, than to cut down a coherent narrative into shreds, and give it the appearance of a collection of aphorisms. This, therefore, I have carefully avoided. The sections are, one with another, nearly equal to two chapters; a few of them more, but many less. In making this division, I have been determined, partly by the sense, and partly by the size. In every section I have included such a portion of Scripture as seemed proper to be read at one time, by those who regularly devote a part of every day to this truly Christian exercise. To make all the portions of equal length, or nearly so, was utterly incompatible with a proper regard to the sense. I have avoided breaking off in the middle of a distinct story, parable, conversation, or even discourse, delivered in continuance.

The length of three of the longest sections in this work, was occasioned by the resolution, not to disjoin the parts of one continued discourse. The sections I allude to are, *the sermon on the mount*, and *the prophecy on Olivet*, as recorded by Matthew, together with our Lord's *valedictory consolations* to his disciples, as related by John. The first occupies three ordinary chapters, the

second two long ones, and the third four short chapters. But, though I have avoided making a separation, where the scope of the place requires unity, I could not, in a consistency with any regard to size, allot a separate section to every separate incident, parable, conversation, or miracle. When these, therefore, are briefly related, inso-much that two or more of them can be included in a section of moderate length, I have separated them only by paragraphs. The length of the paragraph is determined merely by the sense. Accordingly, some of them contain no more than a verse of the common division, and others little less than a chapter. One parable makes one paragraph. When an explanation is given separately, the explanation makes another. When it follows immediately, and is expressed very briefly, both are included in one. Likewise one miracle makes one paragraph; but when the narrative is interrupted, and another miracle intervenes, as happens in the story of the daughter of Jairus, more paragraphs are requisite. When the transition, in respect of the sense, seems to require a distinction more strongly marked, it has been judged expedient to leave a blank line, and begin the next paragraph with a word in capitals.

§ 6. It was not thought necessary to number the paragraphs, as this way is now, unless in particular cases, and for special purposes, rather unusual; and as all the use of reference and quotation may be sufficiently answered by the old division on the margin. In the larger distribution into sections, I

have, according to the most general custom, both numbered and titled them. But as to this method of dividing, I will not pretend that it is not, in a good measure, arbitrary, and that it might not, with equal propriety, have been conducted otherwise. As it was necessary to comprehend distinct things in the same section, there was no clear rule by which one could, in all cases, be directed where to make the separation. It was indeed evident that, wherever it could occasion an unseasonable interruption in narration, dialogue, or argument, it was improper: and that this was all that could be ascertained with precision. The titles of the sections I have made as brief as possible, that they may be the more easily remembered; and have, for this purpose, employed words, as we find some employed in the rubric of the common prayer, which have not been admitted into the text. To these I have added, in the same taste, the contents of the section, avoiding minuteness, and giving only such hints of the principal matters, as may assist the reader to recall them to his remembrance, and may enable him, at first glance, to discover whether a passage he is looking for, be in the section, or not. I have endeavoured to avoid the fault of those who make the contents of the chapters supply, in some degree, a commentary, limiting the sense of Scripture by their own ideas. Those who have not dared to make so free with the text, have thought themselves entitled to make free with these abridgments of their own framing. To insert thus without hesitation into

the contents prefixed to the several chapters, and thereby insinuate, under the shelter of inspiration, doubtful meanings which favour their own prepossessions, I cannot help considering as one way of handling the word of God deceitfully. I have, therefore, avoided throwing any thing into those summaries, which could be called explanatory, and have, besides, thought it better to assign them a separate place in this work, where the reader may consult them, when he chuses, than to intermix them with the truths we have directly from the sacred writers.

§ 7. Most translators have found it necessary to supply some words, for the sake of perspicuity, and for accommodating the expression to the idiom of the language into which the version is made, who; at the same time, to avoid even the appearance of assuming an undue authority to themselves, have visibly distinguished the words supplied, from the rest of the sentence. Thus the English translators, after Beza and others, always put the words in Italics by which an ellipsis in the original, that does not suit our idiom, is filled up. Though I approve their motives in using this method, as they are strong indications of fairness and attention to accuracy; I cannot help thinking that, in the execution, they have sometimes carried it to excess. In consequence of the structure of the original languages, several things are distinctly, though implicitly, expressed, which have no explicit signs in the sentence. The personal pronouns, for example, both in power and in num-

ber, are as clearly, though virtually, expressed in their tongue, by the verb alone, as they are in ours, by a separate sign. Thus, *amo*, in Latin, is not less full and expressive than *I love* in English, or *amavistis* than *ye have loved*. And it would be exceedingly improper to say that in the former language there is an ellipsis of the pronoun, since the verb actually expresses it. For *amo* can be said of none but the first person singular, and *amavistis* of none but the second person plural. The like holds in other instances. The adjective sometimes includes the power of the substantive. *Bonus* is a good man, *bona* a good woman, and *bonum* a good thing. Yet to mark an ellipsis arising from such a want as that of a word corresponding to *man*, *woman*, and *thing*, in the above expressions, the Italic character has sometimes been introduced, by our translators.

§ 8. I REMEMBER that, when I first observed this distinction of character in the English Bible, being then a school-boy, I asked my elder brother, who had been at college, the reason of the difference. He told me that the words in Italics were words to which there was nothing in the original that corresponded. This made me take greater notice of the difference afterwards, and often attempt to read, passing over those words entirely. As this sometimes succeeded, without any appearance of deficiency in the sentence, I could not be satisfied with the propriety of some of the insertions. These words particularly attracted my atten-

tion ¹²³: *Two women shall be grinding at the mill*, where the word *women* is in Italics. I could not conceive where the occasion was for inserting this word. Could it be more improper to say, barely, *two shall be grinding at the mill*, than to say, as in the former verse, *two shall be in the field*, without limiting it to either sex? And since the Evangelist expressed both in the same manner, was any person entitled to make a difference? On having recourse again for information, I was answered that the Evangelist had not expressed them both in the same manner; that, on the contrary, the first, as written by him, could be understood only of men, the second only of women; as all the words susceptible of gender were in the fortieth verse in the masculine, and in the forty-first in the feminine. I understood the answer, having, before that time, learnt as much Latin as sufficiently showed me the effect produced, by the gender, on the sense. What then appeared to me unaccountable in the translators was, first, their putting the word *women* in Italics, since, though it had not a particular word corresponding to it, it was clearly comprehended in the other words of the passage; and, secondly, their not adding *men* in the fortieth verse, because, by these two successive verses, the one in the masculine, the other in the feminine gender, it appeared the manifest intention of the author to acquaint us,

¹²³ Matth. xxiv. 40, 41.

that both sexes would be involved in the calamities of the times spoken of.

This is but one instance of many which might be given to show how little dependance we can have on those marks; and that if the unlearned were to judge of the perspicuity of the original (as I once did) from the additions which it seems by the common version to have required, their judgment would be both unfavourable, and erroneous. The original has, in many cases, a perspicuity, as well as energy, which the ablest interpreters find it difficult to convey into their versions. The Evangelist John says of our Lord¹²⁴, *εις τα ιδια ηλθε, και οι ιδιοι αυτον ου παρελαβον*. I have expressed the sentiment, but not so forcibly, in this manner: *He came to his own land, and his own people did not receive him*¹²⁵. On the principles on which the English translation is conducted, the words *land* and *people* ought to be visibly distinguished, as having no corresponding names in the original. That the old interpreters would have judged so, we may fairly conclude from their not admitting them, or any thing equivalent, into their version. Yet, that their version is, on this account, less explicit than the original, cannot be doubted by those that understand Greek, who

¹²⁴ John, i. 11.

¹²⁵ The verse was so rendered in the former edition. In this I have preferred, *He came to his own home, and his own family did not receive him*. By the same rule the words *home* and *family* should be distinguished here, as *land* and *people* in the other case.

must be sensible that, by the bare change of gender in the pronoun, the purport of those names is conveyed with the greatest clearness. See the note on that passage in the Gospel.

§ 9. OUR translators have not, however, observed uniformly their manner of distinguishing by the aid of Italics. Indeed, if they had, their work must have made a very motley appearance. On many occasions, the Hebrew or Greek name requires more than one word in our language to express a meaning which it often bears, and which alone suits the context. There was no reason, in rendering *γλωσσα*¹²⁶ to put *unknown* in Italics, before the word *tongue*, a strange or unknown tongue being one very common signification of the word, in the best authors. *Πνευματα*¹²⁷ is very properly rendered *spiritual gifts*; it means no less, in the Apostle Paul's language; but there was no propriety in distinguishing the word *gifts* by the Italic letter: for *πνευματα*, a substantive, can in no instance, be rendered barely by the adjective *spiritual*. Sometimes, the word in Italics is a mere intruder, to which there is not any thing in the import of the original, any more than in the expression, either explicitly, or implicitly, corresponding; the sense, which in effect it alters, being both clear and complete without it. For an example of this, I shall recur to a passage on

¹²⁶ 1 Cor. xiv. 2.

¹²⁷ 1 Cor. xiv. 12.

which I had occasion formerly to remark¹²⁸, “The just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back”—where *any man* is foisted into the text, in violation of the rules of interpreting, which compel us to admit the third personal pronoun *he*, as clearly, though virtually, expressed by the verb. I do not remember such another instance, in the English translation, though I had occasion to observe something still more flagrant, in the version of the Old Testament by Junius and Tremellius¹²⁹.

§ 10. It must be acknowledged, however, that the insertion of a word, or of a few words, is sometimes necessary, or at least convenient, for giving a sufficiency of light to a sentence. For let it be observed, that this is not attempting to give more perspicuity to the sacred writings, in the translation, than was given them, by the inspired penmen, in the original. The contemporaries, particularly Hellenist Jews, readers of the original, had many advantages which, with all our assistances, we cannot attain. Incidental allusions to rites, customs, facts, at that time, recent and well known, now little known, and known only to a few, render some such expedient extremely proper. There are many things which it would have been superfluous in them to mention, which it may, nevertheless, be necessary for us to suggest. The use of this expedient has accordingly never been considered as beyond the legitimate

¹²⁸ Diss. X. Part V. § 10.

¹²⁹ Diss. X. Part V. § 4.

province of the translator. It is a liberty, indeed, which ought to be taken with discretion, and never, but when the truth of what is supplied, and its appositeness, are both unquestionable. When I recur to this method, which is but seldom, I distinguish the words inserted by inclosing them in crotchets, having reserved the Italic character for a purpose now to be explained.

§ 11. IN such a work as the Gospel, which, though of the nature of history, is a history rather of teaching than of acting, and, in respect of the room occupied, consists in the relation of what was said more than what was done; I thought it of consequence to distinguish the narrative part which comes directly from the Evangelist, from the interlocutory part (if I may use the expression,) or whatever was spoken either by our Lord himself, or by any of the persons introduced into the work. To the former I have assigned the Italic, to the latter the Roman character. Though the latter branch in this distribution much exceeds in quantity the other, it is but a very inconsiderable part of that branch which is furnished by all the speakers in the history; Jesus alone excepted. Pretty long discourses, which run through whole successive chapters, are recorded as delivered by him, without any interruption.

§ 12. Now, my reasons for adopting this method are the two following: First, I was inclinable to

render it evident to every reader, at a single glance, how small a share of the whole the sacred penmen took upon themselves. It is little, very little, which they say, as from themselves, except what is necessary for connecting the parts, and for acquainting us with the most important facts. Another reason for my taking this method was, because, in a few instances, a reader, through not adverting closely, (and what reader is always secure against such inadvertency?) may not sufficiently distinguish what is said by the historian, from what is spoken by our Lord himself, or even by any of the other speakers, in a conversation reported of them. But it may be objected, 'May not this method sometimes, in dubious cases, confine the interpretation in such a way as to affect the sense?' I acknowledge that this is possible; but it does not at present occur to my recollection, that there are cases in these histories, wherein any material change would be produced upon the sense, in whichsoever of the two ways the words were understood. In most cases it is evident, with a small degree of attention, what are the words of the Evangelist the relater, and what are the words of the persons whose conversations he relates.

§ 13. THE principal use of the distinction here made is to quicken attention, or rather to supply a too common deficiency, which most readers are apt at intervals to experience, in attending. And even, at the worst, it does not limit the sense of the original in one instance, out of twenty wherein

it is limited by the pointing, which is now universally admitted by critics to have been in later times superadded. Indeed, there can be no translation of any kind (for in translating there is always a choice of one out of several meanings, of which a word is susceptible) without such limitations of the sense. Yet the advantages of pointing and translating are too considerable to be given up, on account of an inconvenience more apparent than real.

§ 14. ALL that is necessary in an interpreter, when the case is doubtful, is to remark in the notes the different ways in which the passage may be understood, after having placed in the text that which appears to him the most probable. In like manner, in the case under consideration, wherever there is the least scope for doubting, whether the words be those of the Evangelist, or those of any of the speakers introduced into the history, I assign to the passage in this version, the character which, to the best of my judgment, suits it, giving in the notes the reasons of my preference, together with what may be urged for viewing it differently. It is, in effect, the same rule which I follow in the case of various readings, and of words clearly susceptible of different interpretations; also, when an alteration in the pointing would yield a different sense.

§ 15. IT is proper to add a few things on the use I have made of the margin. And first of the side-margin. One use has been already mentioned,

to wit, for marking the chapters and verses of the common division. Beside these, and a little further from the text, I have noted, in the outer margin, the parallel places in the other Gospels, the passages of the Old Testament quoted or alluded to, and also the places in Scripture, and those in the apocryphal writings, where the same sentiment occurs, or the like incident is related. In this manner, I have endeavoured to avoid the opposite extremes into which editors have fallen, either of crowding the margin with references to places whose only resemblance was in the use of a similar phrase or identical expression, or of overlooking those passages wherein there is a material coincidence in the thought. To prevent, as much as possible, the confusion arising from too many references, and figures in the margin, and, at the same time, to omit nothing useful, I have, at the beginning of every paragraph, referred first to the parallel places, when there are such places, in the other Gospels. As generally the resemblance or coincidence affects more than one verse, nay, sometimes, runs through the whole of a paragraph; I have made the reference to the first verse of the corresponding passage serve for a reference to the whole; and, in order to distinguish such a reference from that to a single verse or sentence, I have marked the former by a point at the upper corner of the figure, the latter by a point at the lower corner, as is usual at the end of a sentence. I have adopted the same method in references to the Old Testament,

to mark the difference between those where only one verse is quoted or alluded to, and those wherein the allusion is to two or more in succession.—These are the only purposes to which I have appropriated the side-margin.

To give there a literal version of the peculiarities of idiom, whether Hebraisms or Grecisms, of the original, and all the possible ways in which the words may otherwise be rendered, has never appeared to me an object deserving a tenth part of the attention and time, which it requires from a translator. To the learned such information is of no significance. To those who are just beginning the study of the language, it may indeed give a little assistance. To those who understand only the language of the translation, it is, in my judgment, rather prejudicial than useful, suggesting doubts which readers of this stamp are not qualified for solving, and which often a little knowledge in philology would entirely dissipate. All that is requisite is, where there is a real ambiguity in the text, to consider it in the notes. As therefore the only valuable purpose that such marginal information can answer, is to beginners in the study of the sacred languages, and as that purpose so little coincides with the design of a translation of the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, I could not discover the smallest propriety in giving it a place in this work.

§ 16. THE foot-margin I have reserved for different purposes ; first, for the explanation of such appellatives, as do not admit a proper translation

into our language, and as, by consequence, render it necessary for the translator to retain the original term. This I did not consider as a proper subject for the notes, which are reserved chiefly for what requires criticism and argument; whereas all the explanations requisite in the margin, are commonly such as do not admit a question among the learned. Brief explanations, such as those here meant, may be justly considered as essential to every translation into which there is a necessity of introducing foreign words. The terms which require such explanations, to wit, the names of peculiar offices, sects, festivals, ceremonies, coins, measures, and the like, were considered formerly¹³⁰. Of certain terms, however, which come under some of these denominations, I have not judged it necessary to give any marginal explanation. The reason is, as they frequently occur in the sacred books, what is mentioned there concerning them sufficiently explains the import of the words. The distinction of *Pharisee* and *Saducee*, we learn chiefly from the Gospel itself; and in the Old Testament, we are made acquainted with the *sabbath*, *circumcision*, and *passover*.

Those things which stand most in need of a marginal explanation, are offices, coins, measures, and such peculiarities in dress as their phylacteries and tufts of tassels at the corners of their mantles. In like manner their division of time, even when it does not occasion the introduction of

¹³⁰ Diss. VIII.

exotic terms, is apt to mislead the unlearned, as it differs widely from the division which obtains with us. Thus we should not readily take the third hour of the day to mean nine o'clock in the morning, or the sixth hour to mean noon. Further, when to Hebrew or Syriac expressions an explanation is subjoined in the text, as is done to the words, *Talitha cumi*, *Immanuel*, *Ephphatha*, and to our Lord's exclamation on the cross, there is no occasion for the aid of the margin. When no explanation is given in the text, as in the case of the word *Hosanna*, I have supplied it on the margin. Of the etymological signification of proper names, I have given an account, only when there is in the text an allusion to their etymology, in which case to know the primitive import of the term is necessary, for understanding the allusion.

§ 17. THERE is only one other use to which I have applied the foot-margin. The Greek word *κυριος* was employed by the Seventy, not only for rendering the Hebrew word *adon*, that is, *lord* or *master*, but also to supply the word JEHOVAH, which was used by the Jews as the proper name of God, but which a species of superstition that, by degrees, came generally to prevail among them, hindered them from transplanting into the Greek language. As the name *Jehovah*, therefore, was peculiarly appropriated to God; and, as the Hebrew *adon*, and the Greek *kyrios*,—like the Latin *dominus*, and the English *lord*, are merely appellatives, and used promiscuously of God, angels, and men, I thought it not improper, when a

passage in the New Testament is quoted or introduced from the Old, wherein the word rendered in Greek *kyrios*, is in Hebrew, *Jehovah*, to mark this name in the margin. At the same time let it be observed, that I have made no difference in the text of the version, inasmuch as no difference is made on the text of the Evangelists my original, but have used the Common English name *Lord* in addressing God, where they have employed the common Greek name *kyrios*.

PART V.

THE NOTES.

I SHALL now conclude with laying a few things before the reader, for opening more fully my design in the notes subjoined to this version. I have in the title denominated them critical and explanatory: *explanatory*, to point out the principal intention of them, which is to throw light upon the text, where it seems needful for the discovery of the direct and grammatical meaning; *critical*, to denote the means principally employed for this purpose, to wit, the rules of criticism on manuscripts and versions, in what concerns language, style, and idiom. I have called them *notes* rather

than annotations, to suggest that, as much as possible, I have studied brevity, and avoided expatiating on any topic. For this reason, when the import of the text is so evident as to need no illustration, I have purposely avoided diverting the reader's attention, by an unnecessary display of quotations from ancient authors, sacred or profane. As I would withhold nothing of real utility, I recur to classical authority, when it appears necessary, but not when a recourse to it might be charged with ostentation. A commentary was not intended, and therefore, any thing like a continued explanation of the text is not to be expected. The criticisms and remarks here offered are properly *scholia*, or glosses on passages of doubtful, or difficult, interpretation; and not comments. The author is to be considered as, merely, a *scholiast*, not a commentator. Thus much may suffice, as to the general design. In regard to some things, it will be proper to be more particular.

§ 2. FROM the short account of my plan here given, it may naturally and justly be inferred, that I have shunned entirely the discussion of abstract theological questions, which have afforded inexhaustible matter of contention, not in the schools only, but in the church, and have been the principal subject of many commentaries of great name. To avoid controversy of every kind is, I acknowledge, not to be attempted by one who, in his remarks on Scripture, often finds himself obliged to support controverted interpretations of passages,

concerning the sense of which there are various opinions. But questions of this kind, though sometimes related to, are hardly ever coincident with, the speculative points of polemic theology. The latter are but deduced, and for the most part indirectly, from the former. Even controvertists have sometimes the candour (though a class of men not remarkable for candour) to admit the justness of a grammatical interpretation which appears to favour an antagonist; no doubt believing, that the deduction, made by him from the text, may be eluded otherwise than by a different version.—But my reasons, for keeping as clear as possible of all scholastic disputes, are the following :

§ 3. FIRST, if, in such a work as this, a man were disposed to admit them, it is impossible to say how far they would, or should, carry him. The different questions which have been agitated, have all; as parts of the same system, some connection, natural or artificial, among themselves. The explanation and defence of one draws in, almost necessarily, the explanation and defence of another on which it depends. Besides, those conversant in systematic divinity, scarcely read a verse in the Gospel, which they do not imagine capable of being employed plausibly, or which, perhaps, they have not seen or heard employed, either in defending, or in attacking some of their dogmas. Whichsoever of these be the case, the staunch polemic finds himself equally obliged, for

what he reckons the cause of truth, to discuss the controversy. I know no way so proper for escaping such endless embarrassments, as to make it a rule to admit no questions but those which serve to evince either the authentic reading, or the just rendering, of the text.

§ 4. My second reason is, I have not known any interpreter, who has meddled with controversy, whose translation is not very sensibly injured by it. Disputation is a species of combat; the desire of victory is natural to combatants, and is commonly, the further they engage, found to become the more ardent. The fairness and impartiality of a professed disputant, who being, at the same time, a translator, has, in the latter capacity, the moulding of the arguments to which, in the former, he must recur, will not be deemed, in the office of translating, greatly to be depended on. A man, however honest in his intentions, ought not to trust himself in such a case. Under so powerful a temptation, it is often impossible to preserve the judgment unbiassed, though the will should remain uncorrupted. And I am strongly inclined to think that, if Beza had not accompanied his translation with his controversial commentary, he would not have been capable of such flagrant wresting of the words, and perversion of the sense, of his author, as he is sometimes justly chargeable with. But, in rendering a passage in the version, to be presently converted into an argument in the annotations, it was not easy for a translator of so great ardour, to refrain from

giving it the turn that would best suit the purpose, of which, as annotator, he never lost sight, and for which, both version, and commentary, seem to have been undertaken, the defence of the theology of his party.

§ 5. My third reason for declining all such disputes is, because the much greater part of them, even those which are treated by the disputants, on both sides, as very important, have long appeared to me, in no other light, than that of the foolish questions which the Apostle warns Titus to avoid¹³¹, as unprofitable and vain; or of the profane babblings and oppositions of science, falsely so called, against which he repeatedly cautioned Timothy¹³². If we may judge of them by their effects, as of the tree by its fruits, we shall certainly be led to this conclusion. For, from the marks which the Apostle has given of the *logomachies*, or strifes of words, then beginning to prevail, we have the utmost reason to conclude, that a great proportion of our scholastic disputes come under the same denomination. What character has he given of the vain janglings of his day, which is wanting in those of ours? Do not the latter gender contention as successfully as ever the former did? Cannot we say, with as much truth of these, as Paul did of those, *whereof cometh envy, strife, revilings, evil surmising, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds?* Do our babblings, any more than theirs, minister

¹³¹ Tit. iii. 9.

¹³² 1 Tim. i. 4. vi. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 23.

godly edifying? Do they not, on the contrary, with equal speed, when they are encouraged, increase unto more ungodliness? Have our polemic divines, by their abstruse researches and metaphysical refinements, contributed to the advancement of charity, love to God, and love to man? Yet this is, in religion, the great end of all; for charity is the end of the commandment, and the bond of perfectness. These questions I leave with every considerate reader. The proper answers will, with the aid of a little experience and reflection, be so quickly suggested to him, that he will need no prompter.

§ 6. LASTLY, Though I am far from putting all questions in theology on a level, the province of the translator, and that of the controvertist are so distinct, and the talents requisite in the one, so different from those requisite in the other, that it appears much better to keep them separate. I have, therefore, in this work, confined myself entirely to the former.

§ 7. FURTHER, I do not attempt, in the notes, to remove every kind of textuary difficulty in the books here translated; such, for example, as arise from apparent contradictions in the accounts of the different Evangelists, or from the supposed contradiction of contemporary authors, or such as are merely chronological or geographical. Not that I consider these, like the dogmas of the controvertist, as without the sphere of a critic on the

sacred text; not that I make it, as in the former case, a rule to exclude them, if any thing new and satisfactory should occur to me to offer: but because, on most questions of this nature, all the methods of solution, known to me, are either trite or unsatisfactory. Much has been written for solving the difficulty arising from the different accounts given of our Lord's genealogy by Matthew and Luke; and different hypotheses have been framed for this purpose. Though I do not pretend to have reached certainty on this question, I incline most to the opinion of those who make the one account the pedigree of Joseph, the other that of Mary. But having nothing to advance which has not been already said over and over by others, and the evidence not being such as to put the matter beyond doubt; I see no occasion for a note, barely to tell my opinion, which is entitled to no regard from the reader, unless so far as it is supported by evidence.

For similar reasons, I have avoided entering upon the examination of the difficulties occasioned by the different accounts given of our Lord's resurrection, and his appearances to his disciples after it. On some of these points there is a danger lest an interpreter be too hasty in deciding. A judgment rashly formed may give his mind such a bias as shall affect his translation, and lead him to make stretches in support of his opinion, which the laws of criticism do not warrant. I acknowledge, on the other hand, that there are instances wherein a small variation, very defensible in the

pointing, or in rendering a particular expression, may totally remove a difficulty or apparent contradiction. In such a case, it would be both uncandid and injudicious, not to give that, of all the interpretations whereof the words are susceptible, which is attended with the least difficulty; and, if the interpretation be uncommon, to assign the reasons in the notes. But, to do violence to the rules of construction, and distort the words, for the sake of producing the solution of a difficulty, is, in effect, to substitute our own conjectures for the word of God, and thus to put off human conceit for celestial verity. It is far better to leave the matter as we found it. In solving difficulties to which we find ourselves unequal, future expositors may be more successful.

§ 8. ONE great fault, far too common with scriptural critics, is, that they would be thought to know every thing: and they are but too prone to think so concerning themselves. This tends to retard (instead of accelerating) their progress in true knowledge: Men are unwilling to part with what they fancy they have gotten a sure hold of, or to be easily stript of what has cost them time and painful study to acquire. Custom soon supplies the place of argument; and what at first may have appeared to be reason, settles into prejudice. It is necessary, in our present state, that habit should have influence even on our opinions. But it is particularly fortunate when the habit, in matters of judgment, extends not barely to the

conclusions, but to the premises ; not to the opinions only, but to the reasons on which we have founded them. When this is the case, we experience all the advantages derived from an habitual association, without much danger of bigotry, or blind attachment. Now it is well known, that opinions hastily formed, preclude all the advantage which may afterwards redound from better information. The truth of this remark is, even in the ordinary affairs of life, too well seen and felt, in its unhappy consequences, every day.

§ 9. AGAIN, I have, in these notes, avoided meddling with questions relating to the order in which the different miracles were performed, and the discourses spoken, and also settling the doubts which have been raised concerning the identity or diversity of some of the facts and speeches recorded by the different Evangelists. I have shunned, in like manner, all inquiry about the time occupied by our Lord's ministry, and about several other historical questions which have been much canvassed. I do not say that such inquiries are useless. A connection with the evidence of other points, which may be of great importance, may confer on some of them a consequence, much beyond, what, at first, we should be apt to imagine. But, in general, I do not hesitate to affirm that, though I have occasionally attended to such inquiries, I have not been able to discover that their consequence is so great as some seem to make it. They are still, upon the whole, rather curious than useful. Besides, on the greater part of them,

little is to be expected beyond uncertainty and doubt.

Some people have so strong a propensity to form fixed opinions on every subject to which they turn their thoughts, that their mind will brook no delay. They cannot bear to doubt or hesitate. Suspense in judging, is to them more insufferable, than the manifest hazard of judging wrong: and, therefore, when they have not sufficient evidence, they will form an opinion from what they have, be it ever so little; or even from their own conjectures, without any evidence at all. Now, to believe without proper evidence, and to doubt when we have evidence sufficient, are equally the effects, not of the strength, but of the weakness, of the understanding. In questions, therefore, which have appeared to me either unimportant, or of very dubious solution, I have thought it better to be silent, than to amuse the reader with those remarks in which I have myself found no satisfaction. In a very few cases, however, I have, in some measure, departed from this rule; and, in order to prevent the reader from being misled in a matter of consequence, by explanations more specious than solid, have even attempted to refute those solutions given by others which appeared to pervert the sense, though I had nothing satisfactory of my own to substitute in their place¹³³. Having said thus much of the purposes for which the notes are not, it is proper now, to mention those for which they are, intended.

¹³³ See the note on Mark, x. 30.

§ 10. FIRST, then, as was hinted before, such different readings as affect the sense, and are tolerably supported by manuscripts, versions, or their own intrinsic evidence, insomuch, that the judgments of the learned are divided concerning them, are commonly given in the notes: their evidence briefly stated, and the reason assigned for the reading adopted in the translation. In this I carefully avoid all minuteness, having no intention to usurp the province, or supersede the labours, of those who have, with so much laudable care and diligence, collected those variations, and thereby facilitated the work of other critics. Indeed, as the variations are comparatively few, which are entitled to a place here; and as, in those few, I do not enter into particulars, but only give what appears the result of the evidence on both sides, I cannot be said, in any respect, to interfere with the departments of such critics as Mill and Wetstein. The little which occurs here ought, on the contrary, to serve as a spur to the learned reader, to the more assiduous study of this important branch of sacred literature. In like manner, variations of consequence, affecting the sense, in versions of such venerable antiquity as the Syriac and the Vulgate, though not accompanied with correspondent readings in any Greek copies, are not often passed over unobserved. In all dubious cases, I give my reason for the reading preferred in this translation, whether it be the common reading or not; and, after mentioning the

other, with what may be urged in its favour, leave the reader to his choice.

§ 11. THE other, and the principal end of these notes, is to assign the reasons for the way wherein the words or sentences of the original are rendered in this translation. As it would have been improper, because unnecessary, to give a reason for the manner wherein every word, or even sentence, is translated, I shall here mention the particular cases in which it has been judged expedient to offer something in the notes in vindication of the version. The first is, when the rendering given to the words does not coincide in meaning with that of the common version. Where the difference is manifestly and only in expression, to make remarks must generally appear superfluous; the matter ought to be left to the taste and discernment of the reader. To attempt a defence of every alteration of this kind, would both extend the notes to an unmeasurable length, and render them, for the most part, very insignificant.

But, secondly, there are a few instances wherein all the difference in the version may, in fact, be merely verbal, though not manifestly so; and therefore as, to the generality of readers, they will at first appear to affect the sense, it may be of consequence to take notice of them. The difference between sound and sense, the words and the meaning, though clearly founded in the nature of things, is not always so obvious as we should imagine. That, in language, the connection between the sign and the thing signified is merely artificial,

cannot admit a question. Yet, the tendency of the mind, when much hábituated to particular sounds, as the signs of certain conceptions, is to put both on the footing of things naturally connected. In consequence of this, a difference only in expression may appear to alter the sentiment, or, at least, very much to enervate and obscure it. For this reason, in a few cases, wherein the change made on the place is, in effect, merely verbal, I have, to obviate mistakes, and to show that, in alterations even of this kind, I have been determined by reasons which appear to me weighty, attempted a brief illustration in the notes.

Thirdly, in certain cases, wherein there is no difference between the common translation and the present, either in thought or in expression, but wherein both differ from that of other respectable interpreters, or wherein the common version has been combated by learned critics, I have assigned my reasons for concurring with the English translators, and for not being determined by such criticisms, though ingenious, and though supported by writers of character. This is the more necessary, as there has been, of late, both abroad and at home, a profusion of criticisms on the sacred text; and many new versions have been attempted, especially in France and England. As these must be supposed to have had some influence on critical readers, it would have been improper to overlook entirely their remarks. Such, therefore, as seem to be of moment, and have come to my knowledge, or occurred to my

memory, I have occasionally taken notice of. This I have done, with a view sometimes to confirm their reasoning, sometimes to confute it, or, at least, to show that it is not so decisive as a sanguine philologist (for even philologists are sometimes sanguine in deciding) is apt to imagine. In this article, the learned reader will find many omissions, arising partly from forgetfulness, and partly from the different judgments which are inevitably formed, by different persons, concerning the importance of particular criticisms. When the decision of any point may be said to depend, in whole or in part, on what has been discussed in the Preliminary Dissertations, I always, to avoid repetitions, refer to the paragraph or paragraphs of the Dissertation, where such a discussion is to be found.

§ 12. ANOTHER purpose for which I have sometimes employed the notes, is the explanation of a name or word which, though from scriptural use it be familiar to our ears, has little currency in conversation, because rarely or never applied to any common subject. Of this kind are the words *parable*, *publican*, *scribe*, of which I have attempted an explanation in the notes: add to these all the terms which, though current in conversation, have something peculiar in their scriptural application. I have generally avoided employing words in meanings which they never bear in ordinary use. As it is from the prevailing use that words, as signs, may be said to originate, and by it

that their import is ascertained, such peculiarities rarely fail to create some obscurity. There are, nevertheless, instances in all languages, in which, on certain subjects (for religion is not singular in this,) common terms have something peculiar in their application. In such cases, we cannot avoid the peculiarity of meaning, without having recourse to circumlocution, or such other expedients as would injure the simplicity of the expression, and give the appearance of affectation to the language. When, therefore, I have thought it necessary to employ such words, I have endeavoured to ascertain the scriptural acceptation in the notes; or, if the explanation has been anticipated in these Dissertations, I have referred to the place. Of such peculiarities, which are far from being numerous in this version, the following will serve as examples.

The first shall be the word *lawyer*, which I have, after the old translators, retained as the version of *νομικος*; not that it entirely answers in the Gospel to the English use, but because it has what I may call an analogical propriety, and bears nearly the same relation to their word *νομος*, that the word *lawyer* bears to our word *law*. The deviation from common use is, at most, not greater than that of the words *patron* and *client*, in the translation of any Roman historian. Some, indeed, have chosen to render *νομικος* *scribe*, and others, for the same reason, to render *γραμματευσ* *lawyer*, because in one instance, a person called *νομικος* in one Gospel¹³⁴, is named in another¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Matth. xxii. 35.

¹³⁵ Mark, xii. 28.

γραμματεὺς. But this argument is not conclusive. Jonathan, David's uncle, we are told¹³⁶, was a counsellor, a wise man, and a scribe. Can we infer from this, that these are synonymous words? The contrary, I think, may be concluded with much greater reason. If then, Jonathan had been called by one historian barely a counsellor, and by another barely a scribe, it would not have been just to infer that counsellor and scribe, though both, in this instance, applicable to the same person, are words of the same import. Yet the argument is no better in the present case. That there is, however, an affinity in their significations can hardly be doubted, as both belonged to the literary profession, which was not very extensive among the Jews. But that they are not entirely coincident, may be inferred from a passage in Luke¹³⁷, where we are informed that our Lord, after severely censuring the practices of the Scribes γραμματεῖς, and Pharisees, is addressed in this manner by one of the νομικοὶ, who happened to be present, *Master, thus saying, thou reproachest us also*. That the reproach extended to them he infers from the thing said, *thus saying*, but there had been no occasion for inference, if they had been addressed by their common appellation, and if scribe and lawyer had meant the same thing. Neither, in that case, could he have said *us also*, that is, *us* as well as those whom thou hast named, the Scribes and Pharisees. Our Lord's reply makes it, if possible, still more evi-

¹³⁶ 1 Chron. xxvii. 32.¹³⁷ Luke, xi. 45. .

dent, that though what he had said, did indeed comprehend them, the title which he had used, did not necessarily imply so much. *Wo unto you ALSO, ye lawyers, ΚΑΙ ὙΜΙΝ τοῖς νομικοῖς καὶ*¹³⁸, which could not have been so expressed, if the denunciation immediately preceding, had been addressed to them by name. Others think *νομικος* equivalent to *νομοδιδασκαλος*, rendering both *Doctor of the law*. But as we have not sufficient evidence that there is in these a perfect coincidence in meaning, and as they are differently rendered in the Syriac version, it is better to preserve the distinction which the original makes, at least in the names.

Another example of a small deviation from familiar language, is in the word *sinner*, *ἁμαρτωλος*, which, in common use, is applicable to every rational being not morally perfect, but frequently in Scripture denotes a person of a profligate life. Now as the frequency of this application, and the nature of the occurrences, remove all doubt as to the meaning, it may be considered as one of those Hebrew idioms, which it is proper in a translator to preserve. Neither *desert* nor *wilderness* exactly corresponds to *ερημος* in the New Testament¹³⁹; but they are near enough to answer the purpose better than a periphrasis. The like may be said of *neighbour*, which, in familiar language, is never used with so great latitude as in holy writ. And in general, when words in scriptural use are accompanied with perspicuity, they ought

¹³⁸ Luke, xi. 46.

¹³⁹ Mark, i. 3. N.

to be preferred to words in greater currency, which are not used in the common translation; and that even though the import of these more familiar words should be sufficiently apposite. It is for this reason alone, that in relation to human characters, we should reckon it more suitable to the language of the Spirit, to say *righteous* than virtuous, *just* than honest.

§ 13. THE only other use I have made of the notes, and that but seldom, is to remark passingly what may serve either to illustrate the character of the style of those writings, or to display the spirit which everywhere animates them: for in these we discover the intrinsic evidences they carry of a divine original. This has induced me, sometimes, to take notice also of the moral lessons to which some things naturally lead the attention of the serious reader. There is not, on this ground, the same hazard, as on the speculative questions of school-divinity, of rousing even among Christians, a whole host of opponents, or stirring up unedifying and undeterminable disputes. Practical observations, though too little minded, are hardly ever controverted. Besides, they are not of that kind of questions which genders strife, but are most evidently of that which ministers godly edifying. On this article, some will think that I have been too sparing. But, in my judgment, it is only in very particular cases, that the introduction of such hints is pertinent, in a scholiast. When the scope of the text is manifestly practical, it is enough that we attend to

the sacred authors. To enforce what they say, by obtruding on the reader, remarks to the same purpose, might appear a superfluous, or even officious, interruption. The effect is fully as bad when the observation, however good in itself, appears far-fetched: for the best things do not answer out of place. Perhaps the least exceptionable account that can be given of such remarks as are at once pertinent, and efficacious, is, that they arise naturally, though not obviously, out of the subject.

§ 14. To conclude; as I do not think it the best way of giving an impartial hearing to the sacred authors, to interrupt the reading of them every moment, for the sake of consulting either the glosses, or the annotations, of expositors, I have avoided offering any temptation to this practice, having placed the notes at the end. When a portion of Scripture, such as one of the sections of this version, is intended to be read, it is better to read it to an end without interruption. The scope of the whole is in this way more clearly perceived, as well as the connection of the parts. Whereas, when the reader finds the text and the notes on the same page, and under his eye at once, the latter tend, too evidently, to awake his curiosity, and, before he has proceeded in the former far enough to have a distinct view of the scope of the passage, to call off his attention; but when they are separated, as in this work, it may be supposed, that a reader will finish at least a paragraph, before he turn over to a distant part of the

book. This method gives this advantage even to the notes, if judicious, that as the argument there used, in favour of a particular reading, or of a particular rendering, of a sentence, is often drawn from the scope and connection of the place, he will be better qualified to judge of the justness of the criticism. It ought always to be remembered that an acquaintance with the text is the principal object. Recourse to the notes may be had only occasionally, as a man, when he meets with some difficulty, and is at a loss how to determine, recurs to the judgment of a friend. For the same reason I have also avoided inserting any marks in the text referring to them. The reference is sufficiently ascertained in the notes themselves, by the common marks of chapter and verse.

THE END OF THE PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS.

March 2. 1833.

March 26. 1851

18y. 3w. 30

31
28
—
59

THE
FOUR GOSPELS,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.

WITH
PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,
AND
NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY GEORGE CAMPBELL, D.D. F.R.S. EDINBURGH.

Principal of the Marischal College, Aberdeen.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

ΜΟΝΗ ΟΥΤΕΟΝ ΤΗ ΑΔΗΘΕΙΑ.

BOSTON :

PUBLISHED BY TIMOTHY BEDLINGTON AND CHARLES EWER.

Treadwell's Power Press.—T. H. Carter, Printer.

1824.

CONTENTS.

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

THE NATIVITY.

CHAPTERS I. II.

THE lineage of Jesus from Abraham:—his conception and birth:—the visit of the magians:—the judgment of the chief priests and scribes concerning the place where the Messiah should be born:—Joseph's retreat into Egypt:—the murder of the infants:—Herod's death:—Joseph's return to Galilee. Page 47

SECTION II.

THE BAPTISM.

CHAPTERS III. IV.

John sent to baptize and announce the Messiah:—Jesus baptized by him, and attested from heaven:—tempted by the devil in the

desert :—returns to Galilee :—calls Peter, Andrew, and the two sons of Zebedee :—gives intimation to the people of the reign of God :—performs miraculous cures.

Page 51

SECTION III.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

CHAPTERS V. VI. VII.

Who are happy :—the disciples of Jesus bound to be exemplary :—he came to ratify the divine law, much impaired by the traditions of the Pharisees :—I. in respect of extent :—exemplified in what concerns ; 1. murder, 2. adultery, 3. divorce, 4. oaths, 5. retaliation, 6. the love of our neighbour :—II. in respect of motive :—where the end is applause, the virtue is destroyed :—exemplified, 1. in almsgiving, 2. in prayer, 3. in fasting.—Did we estimate the stability of the things in heaven compared with the things on earth, we should pursue the former with ardour, and prove superior to all anxiety about the latter :—the service of Mammon incompatible with the service of God :—admonitions to charitableness in judging others ;—to impartiality in judging ourselves ;—to discretion in dispensing religious benefits ;—to assiduity in pursuing spiritual good ;—to humanity and equity in our behaviour to all :—caution against the seducing influence of the multitude, commonly in the wrong :—warning against false teachers, who are best known by their actions :—the wisdom of adding practice to knowledge :—the insignificance of the latter without the former.

55

SECTION IV.

SEVERAL MIRACLES.

CHAPTERS VIII. IX. 1—34.

The cure of a leper,—of a centurion's servant,—of Peter's wife's mother,—of some demoniacs, and others :—those who follow Jesus must do it at all hazards, and without delay :—the stilling of a tempest on the sea :—the cure of two furious demoniacs,—of a paralytic carried on a bed :—Matthew called :—the reason why Jesus associated with sinners ;—why his disciples did not fast :—a woman cured of a bloody issue :—a ruler's daughter restored to life :—the cure of two blind men, and of a dumb demoniac.

Page 64

SECTION V.

THE CHARGE TO THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTERS IX. 35, &C. X. XI. 1.

Jesus selects twelve whom he names apostles :—commissions them to announce the reign of heaven to his countrymen the Jews, empowering them to perform miraculous cures :—to secure them against solicitude, he assures them of the care of Providence, and of the illuminations of the Spirit : he warns them by his own example of what they may expect from men, against the dread of whom he fortifies them by the consideration of the omnipotence of God :—his cause will occasion divisions in families :—by all genuine disciples he will be preferred to every other object :—the smallest services performed from love to him, shall not be unrewarded.

70

SECTION VI.

THE CHARACTER OF THE TIMES.

CHAPTERS XI. 2, &c. XII.

John's message to Jesus :—the testimony of Jesus concerning John :—the people's opinion of both :—the aggravated guilt of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, who had enjoyed the ministry of Jesus, and seen his miracles, yet remained impenitent :—the wisdom of God in adapting his new dispensation to the simple and unlearned, who are invited by Jesus to come under his guidance :—the doctrine of the Pharisees concerning the sabbath confuted, 1. from Scripture, 2. from reason, 3. from their own practice :—the manner wherein they account for his expelling demons exposed :—the danger of detracting from the Holy Spirit :—miracles not intended for gratifying curiosity or captiousness :—the obduracy and folly of the age strongly condemned by the repentance of the Ninevites, and the zeal for wisdom manifested by the queen of Sheba :—the misimprovement of benefits begets insensibility :—who are considered by Jesus as his nearest relatives.

Page 74

SECTION VII.

PARABLES.

CHAPTERS XIII. 1—53.

The parable of the sower :—the reason why Jesus taught in parables :—the explanation of the parables :—the parable of the darnel ;—of the grain of mustard seed ;—of the leaven :—the explanation of the parable of the darnel ;—the parable of the hidden treasure ;—of the precious pearl ;—of the sweep net, with its explanation.

81

SECTION VIII.

THE PEOPLE TWICE FED IN THE DESERT.

CHAPTERS XIII. 54, &C. XIV. XV. XVI. 1—12.

Jesus despised by his fellow-citizens on account of his parentage ; —is informed how John the Baptist was killed by Herod ;—retires to a desert ; is followed by more than 5000 persons whom he there feeds miraculously ;—makes his disciples embark for the other side of the lake ;—follows them in the night, walking on the water ;—entering the bark, stills the storm ;—many, in the country of Gennesaret, cured by touching his garment ;—his disciples vindicated from the charge brought by the Pharisees, who, by their traditions, annulled the law of God :—moral pollution proceeds only from vice :—a demon expelled from the daughter of a woman who, though a Gentile, showed extraordinary faith :—in a mountain, near the sea of Galilee, many cures performed, and upwards of 4000 miraculously fed :—a sign, such as they demanded, refused to both Pharisees and Sadducees :—the disciples cautioned against their doctrine under the name of leaven, which they, interpreting literally, misunderstood.

Page 85

SECTION IX.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

CHAPTERS XVI. 13, &C. XVII. XVIII.

The opinions of the people concerning Jesus :—Peter avows him to be the Messiah :—Jesus asserts the perpetuity of his church soon to be erected :—foretells his own death :—rebukes Peter, who was scandalized at hearing it mentioned :—all who would be followers warned to prepare for sufferings and death :—

Jesus transfigured in the presence of Peter, James, and John :—lets them know who the Elijah was that should come first :—asserts the power of faith :—to avoid giving offence, pays the tribute, though entitled to exemption :—humility the road to eminence in the reign of heaven :—the meanest disciple not to be despised :—snares and offences to be avoided :—the method of reclaiming an offending brother :—personal injuries, though often repeated, still to be forgiven :—the implacable not to expect forgiveness from God :—the parable of the king who reckoned with his servants.

Page 93

SECTION X.

THE RICH MAN'S APPLICATION.

CHAPTERS XIX. XX. 1—16.

What it is that justifies divorce :—who they are that should abstain from marriage :—the people encouraged to bring children to Jesus ; what must be done to obtain eternal life ;—how far endeavours after perfection will carry us :—riches a great obstruction to our admission into the kingdom :—the reward of those who abandon any thing for Jesus :—God gives gratuitously much beyond his promise ;—illustrated by the parable of the labourers in the vineyard.

100

SECTION XI.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

CHAPTERS XX. 17. &C. XXI. XXII. 1—14.

Jesus travelling to Jerusalem, foretells his sufferings and resurrection :—the application of Zebedee's wife in behalf of her sons :—Jesus asserts the necessity of humility in all who would obtain admission into his kingdom ;—gives sight to two blind men ;—rides into Jerusalem on an ass, attended by a multitude shouting

for joy ;—drives the traffickers out of the temple ;—where he heals the blind and the lame ;—devotes the barren fig-tree ;—affirms the power of faith ;—silences the chief priests and elders who question him about his authority ;—contrasts their character to that of the heathen, in the parable of the man who had two sons ;—paints their ingratitude to God in the parable of the husbandmen who ill-treated and killed their landlord's messengers ;—predicts the rejection of the Jews and the admission of the Gentiles into the church ; this further illustrated in the parable of the marriage of the king's son.

Page 104

SECTION XII.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PHARISEES.

CHAPTERS XXII. 15, &C. XXIII.

Jesus eludes the artifices of the Pharisees in his manner of teaching that tribute ought to be paid to their rulers ;—vindicates the doctrine of the resurrection against the Sadducees ;—answers the lawyer who questioned him about what is most essential in the law ;—puzzles the Pharisees with a passage of Scripture which they applied to the Messiah ;—admonishes the people to follow the good instructions, not the evil example, of their teachers, who are reproached with obstructing the access to the kingdom of heaven ;—with making religion a mask to rapacity ;—with their false zeal in making proselytes, whom far from reforming they corrupted ;—with the encouragement their traditions gave to perjury ;—with their exactness in things of no moment, whilst they neglected things of the highest ;—with their care about the cleanness of the outside, whilst they left the inside full of pollution.

110

SECTION XIII.

THE PROPHECY ON MOUNT OLIVET.

CHAPTERS XXIV. XXV.

The destruction of the temple foretold ;—the calamities by which it will be preceded ;—the signs that the Judge is at hand ;—the time of the judgment known only to God ;—men will be surprised by it as formerly by the flood ;—the necessity of activity and vigilance illustrated ;—by the example of servants who expect their master's return ;—by the parable of the ten virgins ;—by the parable of the talents :—account of the procedure at the last judgment.

Page 116

SECTION XIV.

THE LAST SUPPER.

CHAPTER XXVI. 1—56.

The rulers consult together about the method of apprehending Jesus :—a female disciple anoints his head :—Judas bargains with the chief priests to deliver him into their hands :—Jesus eats the passover with his disciples ;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them ;—institutes the commemoration of his death ;—foretells their deserting, and Peter's disowning him :—his deep distress in the garden :—he is seized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas ;—rebukes an apostle for having recourse to the sword.

124

SECTION XV.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

CHAPTERS XXVI. 57, &c. XXVII. 1—56.

Jesus is brought before the Sanhedrim ;—accused of blasphemy, —and condemned ;—is denied by Peter :—Judas, finding that

he is condemned, repents his perfidy ;—restores the price ;—and in despair kills himself :—Jesus is delivered bound to the Roman procurator ;—before whom he is accused by the chief priests and elders ;—Pilate perceiving that the accusation proceeded from envy, and being warned by his wife, not to do aught against Jesus, tries in vain to save him,—by the artifice of granting him to the prayer of the multitude, who were wont to obtain the release of a prisoner at the passover :—the multitude, instigated by their rulers, demand the release of Barabbas, and the crucifixion of Jesus :—Pilate, after washing his hands to testify that he was guiltless of this blood, consents to gratify them :—Jesus is scourged, and mocked, and crucified between two malefactors ;—is insulted on the cross by persons of all ranks, fellow-sufferers not excepted :—his death attended with a preternatural darkness, and other prodigies, which strike the Roman centurion, and guards, with terror. Page 128

SECTION XVI.

THE RESURRECTION.

CHAPTERS XXVII. 57, &c. XXVIII.

The body of Jesus given to Joseph of Arimathea, who deposits it in his own sepulchre :—the sepulchre secured and watched :—his resurrection announced at the sepulchre to some pious women by an angel :—Jesus afterwards appears to them :—the guard bribed by the Jewish rulers to say that the body was stolen when they were asleep :—Jesus appears to the disciples in Galilee,—and commissions them to teach all nations. 134

CONTENTS.

MARK'S GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

CHAPTERS I. II. III. 1—12.

JOHNS mission :—Jesus baptized by him, and attested from heaven ;—tempted by Satan ;—announces in Galilee the reign of God ;—calls Peter, Andrew, James, and John :—performs miraculous cures :—calls Matthew ;—eats with publicans :—vindicates himself and his disciples from the accusations of the Scribes and Pharisees ;—in regard to blasphemy, evil company, neglect of fasting, breach of sabbath. Page 151

SECTION II.

THE NOMINATION OF APOSTLES.

CHAPTERS III. 13, &c. IV. V.

Jesus selects his twelve Apostles ;—is so much crowded by the people, that even his relations speak disrespectfully of him for permitting them ;—the absurdity of the pretext, that by demons

he expelled demons ;—the danger of detracting from the Holy Spirit ;—who accounted kinsfolks by Jesus ;—the parable of the sower, with the explanation ;—the reason for using parables ;—other moral instructions and similitudes ;—Jesus stills a tempest on the sea ;—cures a demoniac who abode in tombs ;—heals a woman who had a bloody issue ;—restores the daughter of Jairus to life.

Page 158

SECTION III.

THE FIRST MISSION OF THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER VI.

Jesus despised by his fellow-citizens ;—commissions the Apostles ;—different opinions concerning him :—the death of John the Baptist :—the disciples report the execution of their mission :—Jesus feeds miraculously five thousand in the desert ;—walks on the sea in the morning to his disciples, who had embarked the night before ;—stills the wind, lands, and cures all who touch him.

166

SECTION IV.

THE ERRORS OF THE PHARISEES.

CHAPTERS VII. VIII. 1—26.

Jesus vindicates his disciples, and charges the Pharisees with annulling the commandment of God by their tradition :—nothing pollutes the man but vice :—a demon expelled from the daughter of a Syrophenician woman of great faith :—the cure of one deaf and dumb :—four thousand men fed in the desert :—a sign in the sky refused to the Pharisees :—the disciples cautioned against their doctrine under the name of leaven, which they interpreting literally, misunderstood :—a blind man cured.

171

SECTION V.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

CHAPTERS VIII. 27, &C. IX. X. 1—31.

The opinions of the people concerning Jesus :—Peter avows him to be the Messiah :—Jesus foretells his own death and resurrection ;—rebukes Peter, who was scandalized at the mention of death :—warns his followers to prepare for suffering ;—is transfigured ;—acquaints them who the Elijah was that should come ;—cures a dumb demoniac :—humility the road to eminence in his reign :—the services of those not to be rejected who did not accompany the Apostles :—no service done for Jesus shall be unrewarded :—the danger of offences and snares :—the marriage tie may not be loosed at the pleasure of either party :—the people encouraged to bring children to Jesus :—what must be done to obtain eternal life :—riches a great obstruction in the way to the kingdom :—the reward of those who abandon any thing for Jesus.

Page 176

SECTION VI.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

CHAPTERS X. 32, &C. XI. XII. 1—12.

Jesus, on the road to Jerusalem, foretells his death and resurrection ;—is applied to, by the sons of Zebedee, for the chief honours in his reign ;—he warns them to prepare for suffering, as the only road to honour then would be humility ;—gives sight to Bartimeus ;—rides into Jerusalem on an ass ;—the people attending him with shouts ;—devotes the barren fig-tree ;—drives the traffickers out of the temple ;—manifests the power of faith ;—enjoins forgiveness on all who would be forgiven of God ;—silences those who controvert his authority ;—illustrates their ingratitude to God, by the parable of the husbandmen who ill-

treated and killed their landlord's messengers ;—concludes with predicting the rejection of the Jews, and the call of the Gentiles.

Page 184

SECTION VII.

THE PROPHECY ON MOUNT OLIVET.

CHAPTERS XII. 13, &C. XIII.

Jesus eludes the craft of the Pharisees, who consult him on the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cesar ;—vindicates the doctrine of the resurrection against the Sadducees ;—answers the scribe who questioned him about what is most important in the law ;—puzzles the Pharisees with an expression in the psalms applied to the Messiah ;—warns the people against the ambition and hypocrisy of the Scribes ;—the liberality of a gift must be rated by the circumstances of the giver ;—the destruction of the temple foretold ;—the calamities by which it will be preceded ;—the signs that the Judge is at hand ;—the time unknown to all but God ;—the necessity of unintermitted vigilance.

189

SECTION VIII.

THE LAST SUPPER.

CHAPTER XIV. 1—52.

The rulers consult together about the method of apprehending Jesus :—a female disciple anoints his head :—Judas bargains with the chief priests to deliver him to them :—Jesus eats the passover with his disciples ;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them ;—institutes the commemoration of his death ;—foretells their desertion, and Peter's denial of him ;—his distress in the garden ;—he is seized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas.

196

SECTION IX.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

CHAPTERS XIV. 53, &C. XV. 1—41.

Jesus is brought before the Sanhedrim ;—charged with blasphemy, —and condemned ;—denied by Peter ;—delivered bound to the Roman procurator :—before whom he is accused by the Jewish rulers :—Pilate perceiving that the accusation proceeded from envy,—tries in vain to save him, under pretence of granting him to the prayer of the multitude, accustomed to obtain the release of a prisoner at the passover ;—they, instigated by their rulers, demand the release of Barabbas, and the crucifixion of Jesus :—Pilate at last consents to gratify them :—Jesus is scourged, mocked, and crucified between two malefactors ;—is insulted on the cross by persons of all denominations, fellow-sufferers not excepted :—his death attended with prodigies, which strike the Roman centurion and other spectators with astonishment. Page 200

SECTION X.

THE RESURRECTION.

CHAPTERS XV. 42, &C. XVI.

The body of Jesus given to Joseph of Arimathea, who lays it in his own sepulchre :—the resurrection of Jesus announced at the sepulchre to some pious women by an angel :—he appears first to Mary Magdalene ;—then to others ;—afterwards to the eleven, whom he sends to publish his doctrine every where, empowering them to work miracles in evidence of their mission ; and is taken up into heaven.

205



CONTENTS.

LUKE'S GOSPEL.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I. 1—4.

Page 229

SECTION I.

THE ANNUNCIATION.

CHAPTER I. 1—56.

THE conception and birth of John the Baptist, announced from heaven to his father Zacharias in the temple :—Zacharias doubting, receives for a sign that he should be speechless till the fulfilment of the prediction ;—returns home with his wife Elizabeth, who, after conceiving, lives some months in retirement :—the immaculate conception and birth of Jesus announced to his virgin mother, by the same heavenly messenger :—Mary's visit to her cousin Elizabeth :—Elizabeth's joy, and prophecy, on the sight of Mary :—Mary's hymn of thanksgiving and triumph. 230

SECTION II.

THE NATIVITY.

CHAPTERS I. 57, &C. II. 1—40.

The birth of John ; his circumcision :—the emperor's edict for registering the people, occasions Mary's journey to Bethlehem ; there she bears Jesus ;—the tidings announced by an angel to shepherds :—their visit to the infant at Bethlehem :—Jesus is circumcised ;—afterwards, at Mary's purification, presented to the Lord, as a first-born male :—the prophecy of Simeon on that occasion ;—and of Anna. Page 234

SECTION III.

THE BAPTISM.

CHAPTERS II. 41, &C. III. IV. 1—13.

Jesus, in tender age, discusses some questions with the rabbies ;—is subject to his parents ;—John sent to baptize and admonish the people, announcing the Messiah ;—the bad treatment he receives from Herod :—Jesus baptized and attested from heaven :—his genealogy from Adam :—he is tempted by the devil. 239

SECTION IV.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

CHAPTERS IV. 14, &C. V. VI. 1—11.

Jesus teaches in Galilee with applause ;—explains, in the synagogue of Nazareth, a prediction of Isaiah :—the people offended,

attempt to throw him down a precipice ;—he escapes their fury ;—expels a demon at Capernaum :—cures Peter's wife's mother of a fever ;—performs many other cures ;—announces the reign of God in the synagogues of Galilee ;—from a bark belonging to Peter, teaches the people on shore ;—by an extraordinary draught of fishes, prefigures the success of his Apostles as fishers of men ; cleanses a leper, and heals a paralytic carried on a bed ;—is charged with blasphemy ;—calls Matthew :—eats with publicans ;—vindicates this conduct ;—also that of his disciples, in not fasting ;—clears from breach of Sabbath, himself for curing on that day, —and them for plucking and rubbing the ears of corn, induced by hunger.

Page 244

SECTION V.

THE NOMINATION OF APOSTLES.

CHAPTERS VI. 12, &C. VII. 1—35.

Jesus selects his twelve apostles ;—afterwards, attended by a great multitude, teaches who are truly happy ;—that we ought to love all men, and do good to all, enemies not excepted ;—warns against uncharitableness in judging others ;—partiality in judging ourselves :—the evidence that a man is good, is his actions, not his professions :—the insignificancy of the latter without the former :—Jesus cures a centurion's servant ;—at Nain restores to life a widow's son :—John's message to Jesus ;—testimony of Jesus concerning John ;—the people's opinion of both.

251

SECTION VI.

SIGNAL MIRACLES AND INSTRUCTIONS.

CHAPTERS VII. 36, &C. VIII. IX. 1—17.

A woman of a bad life anoints the feet of Jesus in the house of a Pharisee ;—whom being scandalized at his permitting it, Jesus instructs in the extent of divine mercy, and its happy consequences ;—travels about, teaching and warning in cities and villages, attended by the twelve and some pious women :—the parable of the sower ;—reason for using parables ;—the explanation :—a lamp not lighted but to enlighten ;—knowledge not given but to be communicated :—who are considered by Jesus as his dearest relatives ;—he embarks ;—meets with a tempest ;—stills it by a word ;—lands ;—cures the demoniac who had the legion ;—and a woman of a bloody issue ;—the daughter of Jairus restored to life :—Jesus sends the twelve, empowering them to cure diseases :—Herod's doubts concerning Jesus ;—Jesus feeds 5000 in the desert.

Page 257

SECTION VII.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

CHAPTERS IX. 18, &C. X.

Different opinions concerning Jesus ;—Peter acknowledges him to be the Messiah :—Jesus foretells his own death and resurrection :—all who would be followers must prepare for suffering :—Jesus transfigured in the presence of Peter and Zebedee's sons ; cures a demoniac ;—again foretells that he will be delivered to his enemies ;—humility the road to preferment in the reign of heaven ;—the meanest disciple not to be despised ;—the services of those who do not accompany the Apostles not to be rejected :—Jesus sets out for Jerusalem ;—is refused admittance into a

Samaritan city on the road ;—the vindictive proposal of two disciples rejected by their Master, with a severe reprimand to the proposers :—those who would follow Jesus, must do it at all hazards, and without delay :—the mission of the Seventy :—the aggravation of the guilt of those who, though they had enjoyed the ministry of Jesus, and seen his miracles, remained impenitent :—the return and report of the Seventy :—Jesus is consulted by a lawyer, as to what must be done to obtain eternal life ;—he explains, by the parable of the humane Samaritan, the meaning of neighbor :—in the example of Martha and her sister Mary, we are taught what is the most important pursuit.

Page 265

SECTION VIII.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PHARISEES.

CHAPTERS XI. XII.

Jesus gives his disciples a model of prayer ;—enjoins importunity ;—cures a dumb demoniac ;—refutes the plea of the Pharisees, that by the aid of demons he expelled demons :—points out the true happiness of man :—Jonah the only sign that would be granted to that generation ;—their obduracy and folly contrasted to the penitence of the Ninevites, and the queen of Sheba's love of wisdom :—a Pharisee, at whose house Jesus dines, scandalized at his not washing his hands before dinner :—Jesus reproaches the Scribes and Pharisees, with being more solicitous about cleansing the outside than the inside ;—with exactness in things of little moment, whilst they neglected things of the greatest ;—with affecting pre-eminence in every thing ;—with hypocrisy ;—with imposing burdens on others, from which they kept themselves free ;—with persecuting the prophets when living, and pretending to honour them when dead ;—with obstructing the people's entry into the kingdom of God :—he warns his disciples of their dangerous doctrine ;—fortifies them against the dread

of their power ;—reminds them of the care of Providence ;—and of the greatness of their future recompense :—the danger of apostacy ;—and of detracting from the Holy Spirit :—warning against covetousness, from the example of a rich fool who exulted in his stores, and knew not that he had a day to live :—against anxiety :—incitements to vigilance and activity :—the doctrine of Jesus the occasion of contention and division :—men attentive and judicious in temporal affairs, often careless and injudicious in spiritual concerns.

Page 273

SECTION IX.

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM.

CHAPTERS XIII. XIV.

Sudden and violent deaths not evidences of greater guilt in individuals, but general warnings to reformation :—the similitude of the barren fig-tree :—an infirm woman cured on the Sabbath :—the similitude of the grain of mustard seed ;—and of the leaven :—salvation demands our utmost vigilance and exertion :—in spite of Herod's designs upon him, Jesus would go about safely for a short time, and then finish his course at Jerusalem ;—his lamentation over that impenitent and devoted city :—a dropsical man cured in a Pharisee's house on the Sabbath :—a warning against forwardness and vanity :—admonition to entertain the needy rather than the wealthy :—parable of the supper to which the invited refused to come :—the necessity of deliberation before we engage in the Messiah's service, illustrated from the example of a prudent builder ;—and of a king at war.

283

SECTION X.

PARABLES.

CHAPTERS XV. XVI.

The lost sheep ;—the lost drachma ;—the prodigal son ;—the unjust, but provident steward ;—the use men make of temporal things here, marks their fitness for the trust of spiritual things hereafter :—admonitions against avarice ;—hypocrisy ;—reliance on the judgment of men ;—against divorce :—the utmost exertion requisite to secure a place in the kingdom of heaven :—the rich man and Lazarus.

Page 289

SECTION XI.

INSTRUCTIONS AND WARNINGS.

CHAPTERS XVII. XVIII. XIX. 1—27.

Nothing more dangerous than to ensnare :—the method of treating an offending brother :—the power of faith :—obedience to the Creator, gives no claim on his favour :—the cure of ten lepers, of whom only one, a Samaritan, proves grateful :—the reign of God not introduced with outward show :—the coming to judgment sudden and unexpected, like the deluge, and the destruction of Sodom :—that disciple is fortified against danger who prefers his Master to every earthly thing :—the parable of the importunate widow and the unjust judge :—the devotions of the Pharisee and of the publican compared :—the people encouraged to bring their children to Jesus :—what must be done to obtain eternal life :—how far the desire of perfection would lead us :—riches a great obstacle to men's admission into the kingdom :—the reward of them who abandon any thing for Jesus ;—his death and resurrection foretold ;—the cure of a blind beggar ;—the conversion of Zaccheus :—the parable of the pounds.

295

SECTION XII.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

CHAPTERS XIX. 28, &c. XX. XXI. 1—4.

Jesus rides into the city on an ass, the multitude accompanying him with shouts ;—laments the obduracy of the city, and foretells its fate ;—drives the traffickers out of the temple ;—silences the chief priests and others who questioned his authority :—the parable of the husbandmen who ill-treated and killed their landlord's messengers :—foretells the rejection of the Jews, and the admission of the Gentiles into the church :—eludes the craft of the Pharisees who question him on the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cesar :—vindicates the resurrection against the Sadducees :—puzzles the Pharisees about the meaning of an expression in the Psalms :—warns his hearers against the vanity and arrogance of the Scribes :—teaches that charity is to be rated more by the ability of the giver than by the greatness of the gift.

Page 303

SECTION XIII.

THE LAST SUPPER.

CHAPTERS XXI. 5, &c. XXII. 1—53.

The destruction of the temple foretold :—the calamities by which it would be preceded ;—the signs that judgment is nigh :—the punishment of the wicked will prove the deliverance of the saints :—the need of unremitted vigilance :—the rulers consult together about putting Jesus to death :—Judas sells him to them :—Jesus eats the passover with his disciples ;—institutes the commemoration of his death ;—acquaints them of the treachery of one of them ;—assures them, that, in his reign, humility and usefulness will prove the only genuine honour ;—foretells the transgression of Peter,—and some of the calamities to

which they were soon to be exposed :—the agony on Mount Olivet :—he is seized by an armed multitude conducted by Judas ;—heals the high priest's servant whose ear had been cut off by one of the Apostles.

Page 308

SECTION XIV.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

CHAPTERS XXII. 54, &c. XXIII. 1—49.

Jesus is brought to the high priest's house ;—denied by Peter ;—abused by the servants ;—tried by the Sanhedrim, and condemned ;—consigned to the Roman procurator, before whom they accuse him of sedition and rebellion :—Pilate not convinced, sends him to Herod, then at Jerusalem :—Herod disappointed of seeing him perform miracles, derides him, and remands him to Pilate.—Pilate perceiving his innocence, tries in vain to save him, on pretence of granting him to the prayer of the people, accustomed to obtain the release of a prisoner at the passover ;—but they and their rulers obstinately demand the crucifixion of Jesus, and the release of Barabbas imprisoned for sedition and murder :—Pilate reluctantly consents to gratify them :—Jesus led to Calvary, the cross carried by Simon a Cyrenian ;—is followed by some female disciples, who lament him ;—is nailed to the cross between two malefactors ;—prays for his enemies ;—is insulted by all ranks ;—one of the malefactors joins in insulting him ;—and is rebuked by the other :—Jesus promises paradise to the penitent criminal ;—the death of Jesus attended with such prodigies as confound the centurion and other spectators.

315

SECTION XV.

THE RESURRECTION.

CHAPTERS XXIII. 50, &c. XXIV.

The body of Jesus given to Joseph of Arimathea, who deposits it in his own sepulchre :—the resurrection of Jesus announced by angels to some pious women at the sepulchre ;—these report it to the disciples :—Peter hastens to the sepulchre, where he finds nothing but the linen :—Jesus appears to two disciples on the way to Emmaus ;—he appears to Peter and afterwards to the eleven ;—he eats with them, and shows them from the scriptures, the necessity of his death and resurrection ;—commissions them to preach his doctrine, after the instructions they were soon to receive from the Holy Spirit ;—leads them out to Bethany,—and having blessed them, ascends into heaven.

Page 320

CONTENTS.

JOHN'S GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

THE INCARNATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE pre-existence, divinity, and creative exertion of the Word :—the light of the world :—the end of John's mission :—the reception of the Word among God's ancient people :—the Word incarnate, the interpreter of God, the fountain of grace and truth to men, visits the earth :—the Baptist's testimony concerning himself :—concerning the Messiah whom God had indicated to him by a visible token :—two of John's disciples, induced by their Master's testimony, follow Jesus :—others also called by Jesus. Page 341.

SECTION II.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

CHAPTERS II. III.

Jesus turns water into wine at a marriage in Cana ;—goes to Jerusalem ;—drives the traffickers out of the temple ;—silences

those who questioned his authority ;—makes many converts, but not all worthy of confidence ;—is visited secretly by Nicodemus a magistratè, with whom he converses on regeneration, faith, and fortitude in the cause of truth :—Jesus retires into the country ;—employs his disciples in baptizing :—this is reported to John,—who gives his testimony of Jesus, exalting his mission and personal dignity much above his own.

Page 345

SECTION III.

THE JOURNEY TO GALILEE.

CHAPTER IV.

Jesus, near Sychar of Samaria, enters into conversation with a Samaritan woman ;—discovers himself to her to be the Messiah :—the disciples, who had gone into the city to buy food, are surprised to find them conversing together :—he acquaints his disciples, that to do the work for which he was sent, was to him as food ;—goes into the city ;—stays two days, making many converts ;—returns to Galilee ;—heals the courtier's son who lay sick at Capernaum.

350

SECTION IV.

THE CURE AT BETHESDA.

CHAPTER V.

The supernatural cures wrought at Bethesda by the agitation of the water ;—a diseased man who lay there, waiting such a cure, healed on the Sabbath by Jesus, who commanded him to

carry home his couch.—Hence some altercation of the Jews,—first with the man,—afterwards with Jesus :—Jesus alleges the example of his Father, from whom he derives both the power whereby he acts, and the wisdom wherewith he teaches :—his mission proved by—1. the testimony of John ;—2. the miracles he wrought ;—3. the declaration of the Father at his baptism ;—4. the Jewish scriptures.

Page 354

SECTION V.

THE PEOPLE FED IN THE DESERT.

CHAPTERS VI. VII. 1.

Jesus feeds five thousand miraculously in the desert ;—while his disciples embark, he retires from the multitude, who intend by force to make him king ;—the night being stormy, he follows his disciples, walking on the sea ;—enters their vessel, which immediately reaches the intended port ;—instructs the people who flock about him, as to the object most worthy of their labour ;—declares himself the bread of life, the source of spiritual nourishment and comfort, prefigured by the manna which the Israelites ate in the desert :—his language so strongly metaphorical proves unintelligible to many, and makes not a few withdraw altogether :—Jesus having asked the twelve, whether they meant to follow their example,—Peter, in name of the whole, acknowledges him the Messiah, professing inviolable fidelity :—Jesus acquaints them that even in their small number there is one perfidious.

358

SECTION VI.

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

CHAPTERS VII. 2, &c. VIII.

Jesus declines going with his kinsmen to the festival ;—when they were gone, sets out privately ;—teaches in the temple,

vindicating his doctrine and mission ;—the chief priests and pharisees send officers to seize him ;—he continues to teach ;—the people are much divided about him ;—the officers return without him, urging for their excuse, the unexampled power of his speeches :—the rage of the rulers mildly checked by Nicodemus :—Jesus dismisses the woman taken in adultery ;—declares himself the light of the world ;—exposes the vanity of the Jewish boasts of liberty ;—of their relation to Abraham ;—of their relation to God :—defends himself against their abuse ;—and when they were preparing to kill him, conveys himself out of their reach.

Page 364

SECTION VII.

THE CURE OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.

CHAPTERS IX. X.

Jesus gives sight to a man blind from his birth :—this excites the astonishment of the neighbours :—the pharisees inquire into the fact, examining first the man,—afterwards his parents,—then again the man himself :—they acquaint him that the person who had cured him must be a bad man, because he had done it on the Sabbath.—As the man who had been cured, declared his dissent from this judgment, they expelled him the synagogue :—Jesus afterwards finding the man, comforts him ;—compares himself to the door of the fold, and to the good shepherd :—divisions among the people concerning him ;—his enemies charge him with blasphemy ;—he vindicates himself, and eludes their designs.

372

SECTION VIII.

LAZARUS RAISED FROM THE DEAD.

CHAPTERS XI. XII. 1—11.

Lazarus of Bethany being sick, his sisters send word to Jesus, who, after two days, returns to Judea, his disciples reluctantly

accompanying him :—Jesus restores Lazarus to life who had been four days buried ;—this proved the means of convincing numbers :—the rulers alarmed, convene the Sanhedrim, where the destruction of Jesus is determined ;—he retires into the country ;—on the approach of the passover, measures are again concerted against Jesus ;—he comes to Bethany,—supps with Lazarus ;—his feet anointed by Mary, who is accused of profusion by Judas,—but vindicated by his Master :—crowds flock to the house, to see not only Jesus, but Lazarus, who had been raised from the dead.

Page 378

SECTION IX.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

CHAPTER XII. 12, &c. XIII.

Jesus rides into Jerusalem on an ass, the multitude shouting :—some Greeks desire to see him :—Jesus foretells his own death, and its effect in engaging disciples ;—warns his hearers to improve the present opportunity, of which they would soon be deprived :—several rulers convinced, but restrained by fear from declaring their sentiments :—Jesus announces his doctrine as directly from God ;—washes the feet of his disciples ;—points out this as an example to them ;—foretells that one of them would betray him ;—by a token acquaints the beloved disciple that Judas Iscariot was the man ;—recommends mutual love ;—warns Peter, more confident than the rest, of his transgression in disowning him.

383

SECTION X.

CONSOLATION TO THE DISCIPLES.

CHAPTERS XIV. XV. XVI. XVII.

Jesus, before his departure, comforts his disciples, assuring them that his absence would conduce to their good, and be but

temporary :—promises them another monitor to supply his place ;—that he will soon discover himself to them, though not to the world ;—the similitude of the vine ;—exhorts to the observance of his precepts, and to mutual love ;—encourages them by his example to bear persecution with constancy ;—warns them of their danger ;—acquaints them of the monitor's functions ;—excites them to pray the Father in his name ;—foretells that their sorrow will be soon succeeded by joy,—and the world's joy by sorrow ;—that his people will have peace in him, but affliction in the world ;—concludes with a prayer to his Father, first for himself, to glorify him in the issue of the awful trial ;—2. for his disciples, to preserve them in unity and truth ;—3. for all the converts that should be made to him through their ministry.

Page 390

SECTION XI.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

CHAPTERS XVIII. XIX. 1—37.

Jesus being betrayed to his enemies by Judas, manifests his power to those sent to apprehend him ;—is brought to the high priest's house and examined ;—is denied by Peter ;—consigned to Pilate, who, after inquiry, finding no cause for condemning,—offers, to the people, to release him, according to the custom which obtained at the passover :—the people, influenced by their rulers, refuse Jesus, demanding that he may be crucified, and Barabbas released :—Pilate causes Jesus to be scourged ;—and, after repeated declarations of his innocence, gives him up to the will of the multitude :—Jesus is brought with two malefactors to Calvary, carrying his cross ;—the charge of his mother he, from the cross, recommends to the beloved disciple, who, from that time, took her to his own house :—the soldiers part his garments among them ;—one of them, with a spear, pierces the side of Jesus when dead.

399

SECTION XII.

THE RESURRECTION.

CHAPTERS XIX. 38, &c. XX. XXI.

The body of Jesus given to Joseph of Arimathea;—he and Nicodemus embalm it, and lay it in the sepulchre:—the sepulchre is found empty early on Sunday morning, first by Mary Magdalene, afterwards by Peter and John:—soon after Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene at the sepulchre, and sends her to acquaint his disciples of his resurrection, and that his ascension would soon follow;—in the evening he appears to the Apostles in a house, and gives them commission to teach:—Thomas, who had been absent, owns, to his fellow-disciples, his disbelief of their testimony:—Jesus appears again to the Apostles, Thomas being present, whose incredulity is overcome by the evidence he had wanted:—again he appears to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias, discovering himself by means of an extraordinary draught of fishes;—eats with them;—draws from Peter thrice, in presence of the rest, a declaration of his love to him:—Jesus gives him charge of his flock,—and foretells his martyrdom;—rebukes his curiosity about the fate of a fellow-disciple. It was that disciple who wrote this Gospel, and was witness of most of the things recorded in it. Page 406

PREFACE

TO

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

THE time when this Gospel was composed, has not been precisely ascertained by the learned. Some have thought that it was written no more than eight years after our Lord's ascension; others have reckoned it no fewer than fifteen. All antiquity seems agreed in the opinion, that it was of all the Gospels the first published; and, in a case of this kind, I should not think it prudent, unless for very strong reasons, to dissent from their verdict. Of the few Christian writers of the first century, whose works yet remain, there are in Barnabas, the companion of Paul, (if what is called the Epistle of Barnabas, which is certainly very ancient, be truly his) in Clement of Rome, and Hermas, clear references to some passages of this history. For though the Evangelist is not named, and his words are not formally quoted, the attentive reader must be sensible that the author had read the Gospel which has uniformly been as-

cribed to Matthew, and that, on some occasions, he plainly alludes to it. Very early in the second century, Ignatius, in those Epistles which are generally acknowledged to be genuine, and Polycarp, of whom we have no more but a single letter remaining, have manifest allusions to different parts of this Gospel. The writers above named are those who are denominated apostolic fathers, because they were contemporary to the Apostles, and had been their disciples. Their testimony, therefore, serves to show not only their knowledge of this book, but the great and general estimation wherein it was held from the beginning.

§ 2. THE first, indeed, upon record, who has named Matthew as the writer of this Gospel, is Papias bishop of Hierapolis in Cesarea, who is said to have been a companion of Polycarp, and hearer of John. Though Irenæus seems to think it was the Apostle John he meant, Eusebius, with greater probability, supposes it was a John who was commonly distinguished from the Apostle by the appellation of *the elder*, or *the presbyter*. Papias, in his preface, does not say that he had heard or seen any of the Apostles, but only that he had received every thing concerning the faith from those who were well acquainted with them. Besides, after naming the Apostle John, he mentions Aristion and John the elder, not as apostles, but as disciples, of the Lord. Concerning Matthew, this venerable ancient affirms that *he wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue, which every one*

*interpreted as he was able*¹. Here we have his testimony, first, that Matthew, (who is also called Levi²) was the writer of this Gospel, for no other was ever ascribed to him, and this was never ascribed to another; and, secondly, that it was written in Hebrew.

§ 3. THE first of these testimonies has never, as far as I know, been controverted. On the contrary, it has been confirmed, and still supported by all subsequent Christian authors who have touched the subject. The second of these testimonies, that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, had a concurrence equally uniform of all succeeding writers in the church for about fourteen hundred years. In the last two centuries, however, this point has been hotly disputed. Erasmus, who, though an eminent scholar, knew little or nothing of Hebrew, was among the first who called in question a tradition which had so long, and so universally, obtained in the Church. "The faults of Erasmus," says Simon³, "were blindly followed by cardinal Cajetan, who not knowing either Greek or Hebrew, was incapable of correcting them." The cardinal has since been almost deserted by the Catholics; and the principal defenders of this new opinion have been

¹ Ματθαιος μεν ονν 'Εβραϊδι διαλεκτω τα λογια συνεταξατο ηρμηνευσε δ' αυτα ως ηδυνατο εκαστος. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 39.

² Mark, ii. 14. Luke, v. 27. 29.

³ Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 5.

Protestants. It is very unlucky for the discovery of truth, when party-spirit, in any degree, influences our inquiries. Yet, it is but too evident that there has been an infusion of this spirit, in the discussion of the present question. ‘If we give ‘up,’ says the staunch polemic, ‘the originality of ‘the Greek text, we have no Gospel by Matthew ‘which can be called authentic; for, to admit that ‘the translation of one book of Scripture may be ‘so denominated, is equally absurd as to admit ‘it of them all; and, if we admit this point, what ‘becomes of our controversy with the Romanists ‘about the decree of the council of Trent, asserting ‘the authenticity of the Vulgate?’ Whitby, who enters warmly into this dispute, urges⁴, amongst other things, the improbability that Providence, which has preserved all the other canonical books in their original languages, should have suffered the original of this Gospel to be so soon lost, and nothing of it to remain in the church but a translation. That all the books are extant which have been written by divine inspiration, is not so clear a case as that author seems to imagine. It will hardly be pretended that it is self-evident, and I have yet seen no attempt to prove it. The book of the wars of the Lord⁵, the book of Jasher⁶, the book of Nathan the Prophet, the book of Gad the Seer⁷, and several others, are referred to in

⁴ Prefatory Disc. to the Four Gospels. ⁵ Numb. xxi. 14.

⁶ Jos. x. 13.

⁷ 1 Chron. xxix. 29.

the Old Testament, manifestly as of equal authority with the book which refers to them, and as fuller in point of information. Yet these are, to all appearance, irrecoverably lost. Other Epistles, beside those we have, there is reason to think the Apostles wrote by the same Spirit. Paul, in what is called his first Epistle to the Corinthians⁸, plainly refers to what he had written to them, in a former epistle now not extant. The artificial methods which have been adopted, for eluding the manifest sense of his words, serve only to demonstrate, how unfriendly the spirit of the controvertist is to the discernment of the critic. And, if we regard the authority of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the Apostle John, Paul wrote more epistles than one to the Philippians, as this venerable father expressly tells us, in his letter to that church⁹. Further, is not what is spoken, equally valuable with what is written, by inspiration? Yet how small a portion of the words of Him *who spake as never man spake*, has it pleased Providence to cause to be committed to writing? How little, comparatively, is recorded of the discourses of these poor fishermen of Galilee, whose eloquence, in spite of all its disadvantages, baffled the wisdom of the learned, the power of the mighty, and the influence of the rich, converting infidels and idolaters, by thousands, to a doctrine to which all their education, prejudices, and passions, rendered them most reluctant, the doctrine of the crucified Messiah? God bestows his fa-

⁸ 1 Cor. v. 9.

⁹ ch. iii.

vours, both spiritual and temporal, in various measures, to different individuals, nations, and ages, of the world, as he thinks fit. Those of former times enjoyed many advantages which we have not, and we enjoy some which they had not. It is enough for us, that this only is required as our duty, that we make the proper use of the Scriptures, and of all the other advantages which, through the goodness of God, we enjoy : for every man is *accepted according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not*¹⁰.

But, indeed, this mode of arguing with regard to Providence, appears to me quite unsatisfactory, as proceeding on the notion that we are judges in matters which, in my opinion, are utterly beyond the reach of our faculties. Men imagining themselves to know perfectly what it is proper for the Ruler of the universe, in any supposed circumstance, to do, conclude boldly, that he has done this or that, after such a particular manner, or such another : a method which, in a creature like man, can hardly be accounted either modest, or pious. From the motives by which men are commonly influenced, we may judge, with some likelihood, what, in particular circumstances, their conduct will be. This is level to our capacity, and within the sphere of our experience. But let us not presume to measure the acts of Omnipotence, and of Infinite Wisdom, by our contracted span. Were we, from our notions

¹⁰ 2 Cor. viii. 12.

of convenience, to determine what God, in possible cases, real or hypothetical, has done, or would do, we should, without hesitation, pronounce that the autographies, the identical writings of the sacred penmen (which are, in strictness, the only originals or perfect standards,) would have been preserved from accidents, that they might serve for correcting all the corruptions which should, in process of time, through the mistakes, the carelessness, or the bad intention, of transcribers, be introduced. For who can deny that the sense of a writing may be as much injured by the blunders of a copyist, as by those of a translator? But if those have not the Gospel, who cannot have recourse to some copy in the original language, not the ten thousandth part of those called Christians, have yet partaken in that inestimable blessing. For how small, comparatively, is the number of those who can read the sacred writers in their own languages? If, therefore, it is truth we desire, and not the confirmation of our prejudices, let us renounce all such delusive reasonings *a priori* from supposed fitnesses, of which we are far, very far indeed, from being competent judges; and let us satisfy ourselves with examining, impartially, the evidences of the fact.

§ 4. THE proper evidence of ancient facts is written testimony. And for this fact, as was observed before, we have the testimony of Papias, as Eusebius, who quotes his words, assures us. For a fact of this kind, a more proper witness than

Papias could hardly be desired: if not a contemporary of the Apostles, or rather, if not known to them, a contemporary of their disciples, and who had been a hearer of two men, Aristion, and John the elder, whom he calls disciples of the Lord. He was one, therefore, who had it in his power to be certified of any fact relating to the ministry of the Apostles, and that by persons who had been intimately acquainted with them. Now, by the character transmitted to us of Papias, he was particularly inquisitive about the sayings and actions of our Lord; and, for this purpose, cultivated an acquaintance with those who had seen and heard him, and could give him the fullest information of all that he did and taught. "I took no delight," says he, "as most people do, in those who talk much, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate strange precepts, but in those who relate the precepts which the Lord hath entrusted us with, and which proceed from the truth itself." It would not be easy for me to imagine what could be objected to so clear an evidence, in so plain a case, a matter of fact which falls within the reach, even of the lowest understanding; for this is one of those points, on which, if the simplest man alive should deviate from truth, every man of sense would impute his deviation to a defect of a very different kind from that of understanding. Yet this is the only resource to which those who controvert the testimony of Papias, have betaken themselves.

§ 5. EUSEBIUS had said of Papias¹¹, that “he was a man of slender parts, as may be discovered from his writings.” This the historian mentions, in order to account for the sentiments of that ancient writer concerning the millennium, who, in the opinion of Eusebius, interpreted too literally and grossly, what the Apostles had seen meet to veil under figurative language. But, not to enter here into the nature of Christ’s reign for a thousand years on the earth, before the general resurrection (a question foreign to the present purpose; and on which, if Papias erred, he erred along with many not deficient in understanding,) a man may be very unfit for judging rightly of a theological or critical question, who would be allowed, by every person of common sense, a competent witness in questions of plain fact, which had fallen under his observation; as whether Matthew had been accounted, from the beginning, the writer of such a Gospel, and whether he wrote it in Hebrew or in Greek.

§ 6. IT seems to be another objection to the testimony of Papias, that he adds, “which every one interpreted as he was able :” as if he could be understood to mean, that every one was able to interpret Hebrew. This clause is an elliptical idiom of that sort, to which something similar, in familiar conversation, will be found to occur in most lan-

¹¹ Σφοδρα γαρ ται βικρος ων τον νουν, ως αν εκ των αυτου λογων, τεκμηραμενον ειπειν φαινεται. Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 39.

guages. Nobody is at a loss to perceive the meaning to be, 'For some time there was no interpretation in common use, but every one who attempted interpreting, did it the best way he could.' The manner in which this addition is made is, to me, on the contrary, a confirmation of the testimony; as it leads me to think (but in this I may be deceived,) that Papias had not from testimony this part of the information he gives; but that it was what he himself remembered, when there was no version of Matthew's Gospel generally received, but every one who could read it in its own language, Hebrew, and either in writing, or in speaking, had recourse to it, translated it as well as he could. Thus, our Scottish Highlanders may say, at this moment, that, till very lately, they had no translation of the Bible into their mother-tongue, that they had only the English Bible, which every one interpreted to them as he was able. Could a reasonable person, on hearing such a declaration, imagine that any thing had been advanced, which could be called either absurd or unintelligible?

§ 7. THE next authority I shall recur to is that of Irenæus bishop of Lyons in Gaul, who in his youth had been a disciple of Polycarp. He says¹²,

¹² 'Ο μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῆ ἰδία διαλεκτῷ αὐτῶν, καὶ γραφὴν ἐξηνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ρώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. cap. 8.

in the only book of his extant, that “ Matthew, “ among the Hebrews, wrote a Gospel in their “ own language, whilst Peter and Paul were “ preaching the Gospel at Rome, and founding the “ church there.” And in a fragment of the same author, which Grabe and others have published, it is said, “ The Gospel according to Matthew “ was written to the Jews; for they earnestly “ desired a Messiah of the posterity of David. “ Matthew, in order to satisfy them on this point, “ began his Gospel with the genealogy of Je- “ sus.”

§ 8. THE third witness to be adduced is Origen, who flourished in the former part of the third century. He is quoted by Eusebius, in a chapter¹³ wherein he specially treats of Origen's account of the sacred canon. “ As I have learnt,” says Origen, “ by tradition, concerning the four Gos- “ pels, which alone are received, without dispute, “ by the whole church of God under heaven; the “ first was written by Matthew, once a publican, “ afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, *who de- “ livered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the “ Hebrew language.* *Εκδεδωκοτα αυτο τοις απο “ ιουδαισμου πιστευσασι, γραμμασιν Εβραικοις συν- “ τεταγμενον.*” In another place he says¹⁴, “ We “ begin with Matthew, who, according to tradition,

¹³ Hist. lib. vi. cap. 25.

¹⁴ Αρχαμενοι απο του Ματθαιου ος και παραδεδοται πρωτος λοιπων τοις Εβραιοις εκδεδοκεναι το ευαγγελιον τοις εκ περιτομης πιστευουσιν. Comment. in Johan.

“ wrote first, publishing his Gospel to the Hebrews, or the believers who were of the circumcision.” Again¹⁵, “ Matthew, writing for the Hebrews, who expected him who was to descend from Abraham and David, says, The lineage of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham.” Let it here be observed, by the way, that the word *παραδοσις*, as used by ancient writers, and sometimes by the sacred penmen, does not entirely coincide in meaning with our word *tradition*. I have here, however, employed this word with the common run of interpreters, that I might not be thought desirous of saying more in the version than the original warrants. The word *tradition*, with us, imports, as the English lexicographer rightly explains it, “ any thing delivered orally from age to age :” whereas *παραδοσις* properly implies, “ any thing handed down from former ages, in whatever way it has been transmitted, whether by oral or by written testimony ; or even any instruction conveyed to others, either by word or by writing.” In this last acceptation we find it used in Scripture¹⁶ : *Hold the traditions, τας παραδοσεις, which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle*. It is only when the epithet *αγραφος*, *unwritten*, is added to *παραδοσις*, that it answers exactly to the English word ; whereas all historical evidence

¹⁵ Ματθαιος μεν γαρ τοις προδοκωσι τον εξ Αβρααμ και Δαβιδ, Εβραιουις γραφων, Βιβλος, φησι, γενεσεως Ιησου Χριστου υιου Δαβιδ, υιου Αβρααμ.

¹⁶ 2 Thess. ii. 15.

comes under the denomination *παράδοσις*. In this acceptation of the term, therefore, to say we have such a thing *by tradition*, is the same as to say, in English, "we have this account transmitted from former ages." In Papias and Ireneus there is no mention of *tradition*. They spoke of what they knew, as they had immediate and most credible attestations from those who were acquainted with the writers of the Gospels, and with every circumstance relating to the publication. Their manner of expressing themselves on this head, is that of men who had the certain knowledge of what they affirm, and therefore consider it as indisputable.

§ 9. It would be endless to bring authorities. Jerom, Augustin, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Eusebius, and many others, all attest the same thing, and attest it in such a manner as shows that they knew it to be uncontroverted, and judged it to be incontrovertible. 'But,' say some modern disputants, 'all the witnesses you can produce in support of this fact may, for aught we know, be reducible to one. Ireneus, perhaps, has had his information only from Papias; and Origen from Papias and Ireneus; and so of all the rest downwards, how numerous soever; so that the whole evidence may be, at bottom, no more than the testimony of Papias.' But, is the positive evidence of witnesses, delivered as of a well-known fact, to be overturned by a mere supposition, *a perhaps?* for that the case was really as they suppose, no shadow of evidence is pretended.

Papias is not quoted on this article by Ireneus, nor is his name mentioned, or his testimony referred to. Nor is the testimony of either urged by Origen. As to Ireneus, from the early period in which he lived, he had advantages for information little inferior to those of Papias, having been, in his younger years, well acquainted with Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John. Had there then subsisted any account or opinion, contradictory to the account given by Papias, Ireneus must certainly have known it, and would probably have mentioned it, either to confirm, or to confute, it. As the matter stands, we have here a perfect unanimity of the witnesses, not a single contradictory voice : no mention is there, either from those fathers, or from any other ancient writer, that ever another account of this matter had been heard of in the church. Shall we then admit a mere modern hypothesis, to overturn the foundations of all historic evidence ?

§ 10. LET it be observed that Papias, in the words quoted from him, attested two things ; that Matthew wrote the Gospel ascribed to him, and that he wrote it in Hebrew. These two points rest on the same bottom, and are equally, as matter of fact, the subjects of testimony. As to both, the authority of Papias has been equally supported by succeeding authors, and by the concurrent voice of antiquity. Now there has not any thing been advanced to invalidate his testimony, in regard to the latter of these, that may not, with equal justice, be urged, to invalidate his testimony,

in regard to the former. This may be extended also to other points ; for, that Mark was the writer of the Gospel commonly ascribed to him, rests ultimately on the same authority. How arbitrary then is it, where the evidence is the same, and exposed to the same objections, to admit the one without hesitation, and to reject the other? Wetstein, for removing this difficulty, has suggested a distinction, insinuating, that the former may be the testimony of Papias, the latter only his conjecture. But if the words of Papias himself be attended to, no conjecture was ever worse founded than this of Wetstein. Papias speaks of both in the same affirmative tone, as of matters of public notoriety.

I shall conclude the argument with observing, that the truth of the report, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, is the only plausible account that can be given of the rise of that report. Certain it is, that all the prejudices of the times, particularly among the Greek Christians, were unfavourable to such an opinion. Soon after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, the Hebrew church, distinguished by the name *Nazarene*, visibly declined every day ; the attachment which many of them still retained to the ceremonies of the law, in like manner the errors of the Ebionites, and other divisions which arose among them, made them soon be looked upon, by the Gentile churches, as but half-christian, at the most. That an advantage of this kind would have been so readily conceded to them by the Greeks, in opposition to

all their own prejudices, can be attributed only to their full conviction of the fact.

§ 11. DR. LARDNER'S doubts (for I can discover none in Origen) are easily accounted for. Averse, on one hand, to admit that there is any book of Scripture whereof we have only a translation, and sensible of the danger of acquiescing in an argument which would unsettle the whole foundations of his system of credibility, he is inclinable to compromise the matter, by acknowledging both the Hebrew and the Greek to be originals, an opinion every way improbable, and so manifestly calculated to serve a turn, as cannot recommend it to a judicious and impartial critic. In this way of compounding matters, Whitby also, and some other disputants on the same side, seem willing to terminate the difference. Nay, even Beausobre and Lenfant, who have treated the question at more length, and with greater warmth, than most others, conclude, somewhat queerly, in this manner. "As there is no dispute affecting the foundation, that is, the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, such as we have it, the question about the language ought to be regarded with much indifference¹⁷."

¹⁷ Ainsi n'y ayant point de dispute sur le fond de la chose même, c'est-à-dire, sur l'autorité de l'évangile de S. Matthieu, tel que nous l'avons, la question de la langue doit être regardée avec beaucoup d'indifférence. Preface sur S. Matthieu, iii. 5.

§ 12. HAVING said so much on the external evidence, I shall add but a few words, to show, that the account of this matter, given by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, is not so destitute, as some may think, of internal probability. In every thing that concerned the introduction of the new dispensation, a particular attention was for some time shown, and the preference, before every other nation, given to the Jews. Our Lord's ministry upon the earth was among them only. In the mission of the Apostles, during his own life, they were expressly prohibited from going to the Gentiles, or so much as entering any city of the Samaritans¹⁸; and when, after our Lord's resurrection, the apostolical commission was greatly enlarged, being extended to all nations throughout the world, still a sort of precedency was reserved for God's ancient people. *It behoved the Messiah*, said Jesus¹⁹, in his last instructions to the Apostles, *to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations*, BEGINNING AT JERUSALEM. The orders then given were punctually executed. The Apostles remained some time in Jerusalem, preaching, and performing miracles in the name of the Lord Jesus, with wonderful success. Peter, in the conclusion of one of his discourses, without flattering his countrymen, that this dispensation of grace would, like the law, be confined to their nation, takes notice of their prero-

¹⁸ Matth. x. 5.

¹⁹ Luke, xxiv. 46, 47.

gative, in having it first offered to their acceptance. *To YOU FIRST*, says he²⁰, *God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* And when the disciples began to spread their Master's doctrine through the neighbouring regions, we know that, till the illumination they received in the affair of Cornelius, which was several years after, they confined their teaching to their countrymen, the Jews. And, even after that memorable event, wherever the Apostles came, they appear first to have repaired to the synagogue, if there was a synagogue in the place, and to have addressed themselves to those of the circumcision, and afterwards to the Gentiles. What Paul and Barnabas said, to their Jewish brethren at Antioch²¹, sets this matter in the strongest light. *It was NECESSARY that the word of God should FIRST HAVE BEEN SPOKEN TO YOU: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.* Have we not then reason to conclude, from the express order, as well as from the example, of our Lord, and from the uniform practice of his disciples, that it was suitable to the will of Providence, in this dispensation of grace, that every advantage should be first offered to the Jews, especially the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and that the Gospel, which had been first delivered to them by word, both by our Lord himself, and by his Apostles,

²⁰ Acts, iii. 26.

²¹ Acts, xiii. 46.

should be also first presented to them in writing, in that very dialect in which many of the readers, at the time of the publication, might remember to have heard the same sacred truths, as they came from the mouth of Him who spake as never man spake, the great oracle of the Father, the interpreter of God?

§ 13. If the merciful dispensation was, in effect, soon frustrated by their defection; this is but of a piece with what happened in regard to all the other advantages they enjoyed. The sacred deposit was first corrupted among them, and afterwards it disappeared: for that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, used by the Nazarenes (to which, as the original, Jerom sometimes had recourse²², and which he tells us, he had translated into Greek and Latin,) and that the Gospel also used by the Ebionites, were, though greatly vitiated and interpolated, the remains of Matthew's original, will, notwithstanding the objections of Mill and others, hardly bear a reasonable doubt. Their loss of this Gospel proved the prelude to the extinction of that church. But we have reason to be thankful, that what was most valuable in the work, is not lost to the christian community. The version we have in Greek is written with much evangelical simplicity, entirely in the idiom and manner of the Apostles. And I freely acknowledge, that if the Hebrew Gospel were still extant, such as it was in the days of Jerom, or

²² Hier. Com. in Mat. lib. i. cap. 16. Matth. vi. 11. N.

even of Origen, we should have much more reason to confide in the authenticity of the common Greek translation than in that of an original wherewith such unbounded freedoms had been taken. The passages quoted by the ancients from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which are not to be found in the Gospel according to Matthew, bear intrinsic marks, the most unequivocal, of the baseness of their origin.

§ 14. It may be proper here to enquire a little more particularly what language it was that the ancient ecclesiastical writers meant by Hebrew, when they spoke of the original of this Gospel. I should have scarcely thought this inquiry necessary, had I not observed that this matter has been more misunderstood, even by authors of some eminence, than I could have imagined. Beausobre and Lenfant in particular, go so far as to argue against the probability of the fact, because, what we commonly call Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, was not then spoken either in Palestine, or any where else, being understood only by the learned. And that the common language of the country was not meant, they conclude, from the use which Eusebius, who calls the original of Matthew's Gospel Hebrew, makes of the word Syriac, when he says of Bardasenes, that he was eloquent in the Syrian language. 'Thus,' say they, 'he knew how to distinguish between Hebrew and the language of the country, which he calls Syriac.' But in this these critics them-

selves have unluckily fallen into a mistake, in supposing that Syriac was, in the time of our Lord and his Apostles, or, during the subsistence of the Jewish polity, the language of Palestine. That their language, at that time, had a mixture of the Syrian language, is acknowledged; but not that it was the same. It was what Jerom very aptly calls Syro-chaldaic, having an affinity to both languages, but much more to the Chaldean than to the Syrian. It was, in short, the language which the Jews brought with them from Babylon after the captivity, blended with that of the people whom they found, at their return, in the land, and in the neighbouring regions. It is this which is invariably called Hebrew in the New Testament; I might have said, in Scripture, no language whatever being so named in the Old Testament. It is denominated Hebrew, as Lightfoot has, from some rabbinical writings, with great probability, suggested²³, because the language of the persons who returned from captivity, would readily be called, by those who possessed the land, *lingua transfluviana*, or *transeuphratensis*, the language of the people beyond the Euphrates, the river which they had passed in returning to their own country; and the name, as often happens, would be retained, when the language was much altered. We are surprised, indeed, to find this learned author, in another place²⁴, in contradiction to this, maintaining that the Syriac was the mother-tongue

²³ Hor. Heb. Jo. v. 2.

²⁴ Hor. Heb. Matth. i. 23.

of the Jews, after the captivity ; and still more, to observe, that he advances some things, on the subject, which will be found, if attended to, totally to subvert his argument.

§ 15. ABRAM was in Canaan called *the Hebrew*²⁵, for this reason, probably, because he was from the farther side of the great river, not because he was descended from Heber, one indeed in the line of his progenitors, but one of whom nothing remarkable is mentioned to distinguish him from the rest. Heber was neither the first after the sons of Noah, nor the immediate father of the Patriarch. Accordingly, the word is, in that passage where Abram is so named, which is the first time it occurs, rendered by the Seventy *ὁ περατῆς transitor*. The Canaanites, amongst whom he sojourned, appear to have used the name *Hebrew* in a manner similar to that wherein the Italians use the word *Tramontani* for all who live north of the Alps. The peculiarity, in respect both of religion and of customs, which continued in Abram's posterity, in the line of Jacob, and prevented them from mingling with other nations, or adopting their manners, must have been the reason why this appellation was given to the descendants in continuance, which, in strictness, was applicable to the first comers only. But, let it be observed, that, though this term was very early used of the nation, it was not applied to the

²⁵ Gen. xiv. 13.

language brought by Abram and his family from Ur of the Chaldæes, a language which they soon lost, acquiring, in its stead, that of the Canaanites, amongst whom they lived. Abram's tongue was, doubtless, Chaldee, that of the country whence he came. But we learn from the sacred historian, that Jacob his grandson (though he could not fail to understand that language, having lived so long with Laban) spoke at home a different tongue. *Laban* called the heap which they had raised *Jegar-sahadutha* : but *Jacob* called it *Galeed*²⁶. Both names signify the same thing, *the heap of testimony*, the former being Chaldee, the latter what is now always called *Hebrew*, but then, *the language of Canaan*.

I have observed already, that the language of the Old Testament, which we now always call Hebrew, is never so called in Scripture, neither in the Old Testament, nor in the New. This is a strong presumption that it was not anciently so named by any body, and that if any language had been in the Old Testament named Hebrew, it would have been the Chaldee, agreeably to the etymology of the word Hebrew, the language of those who lived beyond the Euphrates. This, however, might be accounted no more than a presumption, perhaps but a plausible conjecture, if the language of the Israelites were not repeatedly mentioned in the Old Testament by other names. It is commonly called there *the Jews language*²⁷, and in one place, *the language of Canaan*²⁸. That

²⁶ Gen. xxxi. 47. ²⁷ 2 Kings, xviii. 26. 28. 2 Chron. xxxii. 18. Neh. xiii. 24. Isa. xxxvi. 11. 13. ²⁸ Isa. xix. 18-

in after-times the ancient Jewish tongue, which was often named the holy language, was also called *Hebrew*, is not denied. Josephus, in particular, names it so²⁹, in relating the message of Rabshakeh from the king of Assyria to king Hezekiah above referred to, as he uses the word *Ἑβραϊστί*, in *Hebrew*, where the sacred historian has said *יהודית* *Jehudith*, and the Seventy *Ἰουδαϊστί*, in the *Jews language*. But this is long posterior to the finishing of the canon of the Old Testament; for Josephus did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem, towards the end of the first Christian century. In the prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus, the term *Ἑβραϊστί* is likewise used, but it is not certain in what acceptation. By the account given there, that book was translated into Greek in the time of Ptolemy Evergetes king of Egypt, by Jesus, who was the son of Sirach, and the grandson of Jesus the author. As the original, therefore, must have been written long after the captivity, it is much more probable that it was composed in the dialect spoken in Palestine at the time, than that it was written in a dead language, understood only by the learned, and consequently that the word occurs, in that prologue, in the same acceptation wherein it is always used in the New Testament. It has, in my judgment, been proved beyond contradiction by the learned, particularly Bochart³⁰, Walton³¹, and Le Clerc³²,

²⁹ Antiq. lib. x. cap. 1. ³⁰ Canaan, L. ii. c. 1.

³¹ Prolegomena, iii. 13, &c.

³² Proleg. in Pentateuch. Diss. I. V.

that the language of the Old Testament is no other than the native tongue of the Canaanites, which, in Greek writers, is called Phenician, and did not materially differ from the dialect of the Tyrians, Sidonians, and Carthaginians. *Canaan* is rendered by the Seventy³³ φοινικη *Phenicia*. A *Canaanitish* woman φοινισση³⁴, a *Phenician* woman, and the land of Canaan is called ἡ χώρα των φοινικων³⁵, *the country of the Phenicians*. And even in the New Testament we have a plain proof that the names were used promiscuously, inasmuch as the person who is called by one Evangelist a woman of Canaan³⁶, is denominated by another Evangelist a Syrophenician³⁷.

§ 16. AT the same time it ought to be remarked that the language of Chaldea, which, before the captivity, seems never to have been denominated Hebrew, was always, by the Jews, distinguished by some other name. The most common was that which, in the English translation, after the Septuagint and the Vulgate, is rendered *Syrian*, but is in the original אַרְמִית *Aramith*. It is so called in some of the places above quoted, and in like manner by Ezra³⁸. The Oriental name *Aram*, though commonly rendered *Syria*, does not exactly correspond in meaning to this word, at least in the use made of it in latter times. The boundary of Syria on the east, when the name came to be

³³ Exod. xvi. 35.

³⁴ Exod. vi. 15.

³⁵ Josh. v. 12.

³⁶ Matth. xv. 22.

³⁷ Mark, vii. 24.

³⁸ Ezra, iv. 7.

used in a more confined manner, was the river Euphrates; whereas Aram comprehended large tracts of country beyond the river, as Mesopotamia, Chaldea, Assyria. Syria was included, but it made only a part. Now the Jewish language was so different from this, that it is manifest the common people anciently in Judea understood nothing of *Aramic* or Chaldee. For a proof of this we need recur only to some of the places above referred to³⁹. Further, it is of the same people, the Chaldeans, that the Prophet speaks in this prediction⁴⁰: *Lo, I will bring a nation upon you from afar, O house of Israel, saith the Lord; it is a mighty nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language thou knowest not, neither understandest what they say.*

§ 17. BUT, it may be said, since the name *Aram* included the country commonly called Syria, and was equally applicable to it as to any other part, and since the word *Aramith* was employed to denote the language of the whole; the Syrian and the Chaldean must have been one and the same language. That they were so originally, I am fully convinced. In process of time, however, from the different fates to which the eastern parts, and the western, of that once great empire were subjected, there gradually sprang up a considerable difference between them, insomuch that, in latter times, they may, not unfitly, be denominated

³⁹ 2 Kings, xviii. 26. Isa. xxxvi. 11.

⁴⁰ Jer. v. 15.

different languages ; though still they have more affinity to each other than any other two of the Oriental tongues. The same language is called also very properly⁴¹, *the tongue of the Chaldeans*. Now as the Jews, when they returned from captivity, brought a dialect of this language with them into their own country, it suited their national pride to adopt such a general name as Hebrew, which, though it may signify, when explained from etymology, the language spoken beyond the river, would be generally understood to denote the language of the people called Hebrews, a name by which their nation had been distinguished from the beginning. This appellation, therefore, must appear more eligible to them, than any name which would serve more directly to remind themselves and others, that they had lived so long in subjection to another people ; a disagreeable effect, which could not fail to result from their calling the language they had adopted Chaldee, Babylonian, or even the language of Aram. Besides, to have called it so, would have confounded it with a language considerably different.

§ 18. WE have no reason to consider the dialect which the Jews introduced into Judea, on their return from the Babylonish captivity, as entirely pure. But in whatever state it might have been at first, it cannot be imagined that its purity could

⁴¹ Dan. i. 4.

have been preserved five hundred years, especially considering the great variety of calamities, as well as the different species of tyranny which the nation experienced in that interval. The language of the neighbours, and of those who, from the circumjacent countries, had, during the people's absence, possessed the land, which was chiefly Syriac, would have a considerable share in the ordinary speech. With these we might expect to find a mixture of Persic, Greek, and Latin, words, as Judea had been successively subjected to the Macedonians, the Persians, and the Romans. Exactly such it is found to have been in the time of our Saviour. What, therefore, is called Hebrew, in the New Testament; and by the earliest fathers, is not the language of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, spoken by the Jews in Palestine before the captivity; it is not the Chaldee spoken in Babylon; neither is it the Syriac spoken in the neighbouring country of Syria; but it is a dialect formed of all the three languages, chiefly the two last blended together, and which is therefore properly denominated Syro-Chaldaic, as having a great affinity to both, and, at the same time, retaining much of the old Hebrew idiom.—After the destruction of Jerusalem, the extinction of the Jewish polity, and the dispersion of the people by the Romans, their particular dialect fell quickly into disuse; and Syriac, the language of the province (for to Syria Palestine had before now been annexed,) became soon the prevailing language of the whole country. This will perhaps, in part, account for the undoubted fact, that a

correct copy of Matthew's original was in a short time no where to be found. The very dialect shared in the fate of the people, and did not long survive their city and temple.

§ 19. FURTHER, that the language of the Syriac version of the New Testament (though justly accounted much nearer to the language used by our Lord and his Apostles than that of any other version now extant) is not properly the same language, may be proved from that very translation itself; where we sometimes, not always, find a difference between the words which the sacred writers have retained in their original form, and those employed by the Syriac interpreter. In some cases, I admit, they are the same. Thus, the Evangelist Mark has given, in his Gospel⁴², the original expression, *Talitha cumi*, used by our Lord, adding the interpretation into Greek. The Syriac translator employs also the original expression, but adds no interpretation, finding that it suits equally the Syrian language, as that which in the New Testament is called Hebrew. Nay, the same expression is used, in another Gospel in the Syriac⁴³, where the Evangelist had not, as Mark, introduced the original words. Also many words, as *rabbi* and *abba*, are the same in both. This may likewise be said of the word *Ephphatha*⁴⁴ (though spelt a little differently) to which

⁴² Ch. v. 41

⁴³ Luke, viii. 54.

⁴⁴ Mark, vii. 34.

no interpretation is added in the Syriac version. The small difference in spelling ought to be ascribed solely to the Greek original, and not to any variation in the Syriac from the Hebrew. It was customary, in writing Greek, to make such alterations on foreign words introduced, as suited the Grecian orthography. Hence the many changes in the Septuagint, on the names of the Old Testament. As to some proper names, which have the signification of appellatives, *Cephas* being of the same import in both languages, needed not an interpretation in Syriac as in Greek⁴⁵. On the name *Thomas* there was an inconsiderable difference. What was *Thaoma* in the dialect of Jerusalem, was, in proper Syrian *Thama*. This interpretation is thrice given in the Syriac version of John's Gospel⁴⁶, as answering to the Greek *Αιδυμος*, *twin*. Boanerges⁴⁷, Aceldama⁴⁸, and Golgotha⁴⁹, are all translated by that interpreter, who would not have made this distinction, with regard to them, if he had thought them equally intelligible to Syrian readers, with the terms whereof he has given no explanation. As to the change made by that interpreter on the cry, *Eli, eli*, uttered by our Lord on the cross, I must refer the reader to the notes on the passages⁵⁰ where it is mentioned. On the name *Siloam*⁵¹, a small alteration is made; and no interpretation is added, as

⁴⁵ John, i. 42.⁴⁶ Ch. xi. 16. xx. 24. xxi. 2.⁴⁷ Mark, iii. 17.⁴⁸ Acts, i. 19.⁴⁹ Matth. xxvii. 33.⁵⁰ Matth. xxvii. 46. Mark, xv. 34.⁵¹ John, ix. 7.

in the Greek, because the word, so altered, conveys the same meaning in Syriac, which *Siloam* did in the dialect of Jerusalem, and consequently needs no interpretation. All these observations serve to show both the affinity of the two languages, and their difference. The difference, in my judgment, was enough to render one of them unintelligible to those who were accustomed only to the other; and the affinity was so great, as to render a very little practice sufficient to qualify those who spoke the one, for understanding the other. Whether the same may not be said of some northern European tongues, as German, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish, or even of those of the southern regions, as French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish, I leave to those, who are best acquainted with these languages, to determine.

§ 20. I SHALL add only one remark more for evincing the difference between the language called *Hebrew* in the New Testament, and the Syriac: it is this, that the name always given to Syria, in the Syriac version, is not *Aram*, as in the Old Testament, but סוריא *Suria*; whence, according to analogy, the name appropriated to the language is סוריאית *Suriaith*⁵²: whereas Ἑβραϊστί, in the Greek New Testament, or τῆ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλεκτῷ, is never rendered *Suriaith*, but *Ghi-*

⁵² Shaffii Lexicon Syriac. N. T. editio 2^{da} prætermisssa.

braith. See the passages quoted in the margin ⁵³; in some of which, we have both the name itself, in what is called *Hebrew*, the language of the place, and, for the sake of the Syriac reader, an interpretation of the name into that tongue. This shows evidently, that the Hebrew word had no currency with them, as it needed an explanation. Nay more, in the postscript subjoined to the Syriac version of this Gospel, the language in which Matthew wrote and preached, is not termed *Su-riaiith*, but *Ghibraith* ⁵⁴. Let it be observed, that I urge this, not as a testimony of the fact, (as a testimony it is not needed, and would be of very little consequence,) but solely, to mark the distinction observed in the application of the words Syriac and Hebrew. But, enough for showing that the language called *Hebrew* by the writers of the New Testament, is not the same with the language of the Old Testament, which is never in Scripture called *Hebrew*; that it is neither pure *Syriac* nor *Chaldee*, but that it approaches nearest the last of these, though with a considerable mixture of the other two. An attention to these things will serve to show, how ill-founded many things are, which have been advanced on this subject, by Basnage, Beausobre, and others ⁵⁵.

⁵³ Luke, xxiii. 38. John, v. 2. xix. 13. 17. 20. Acts, xxi. 40. xxii. 2. xxvi. 14. Rev. ix. 11. xvi. 16.

⁵⁴ The postscript, literally translated, is, "Here endeth the holy Gospel of Matthew's preaching, which he preached in Hebrew, in the land of Palestine."

In a late celebrated work, an hypothesis is hinted which

§ 21. WHEN men's opinions favour their known prejudices, this circumstance is a considerable

differs from all the preceding. "Did Christ," says Mr. Gibbon, Vol. 4. p. 381. N. 131, "speak the rabbinical or "Syriac tongue?" The latter part of this question is answered already: to the former the answer is plain. No such tongue was known then as the rabbinical. This dialect, which owes its origin to the dispersion of the Jews, after the destruction of Jerusalem, by the Romans, was never the language of the people any where: its use was solely among the Jewish doctors or rabbies, whence it has its name. The language of the people would, after they were scattered through Europe, Asia, and Africa, soon be supplanted by the languages of the different regions into which they were dispersed. As to those Jews who were qualified for study, they had the strongest inducements to make the language of the Old Testament the principal object of their attention. The constant use of it in their synagogues served both as a spur to the study, and as an help in the acquisition. When use had rendered it familiar to them, nothing could be more natural than to employ it as the medium of correspondence with their learned countrymen in distant lands. They had no other common language; and this had one advantage (of greater moment to them, considering the unchristian treatment they commonly met with from christian nations) that nobody understood it but themselves. From using it, at first, in conveying their remarks on the sacred text, they came gradually to extend it to the discussion of other topics, historical, philosophical, &c. It will easily be conceived that, having no standard but the O. T. they would be often at a loss for words; for however rich that language may, originally, have been, it is but a small part of its treasure which can be contained in so narrow a compass. How much would one of us find himself embarrassed in composing in Eng-

abatement from the authority of such opinions; and even when their testimony favours their prejudices, there is still ground for abatement, though

lish, if limited to the words employed in the common translation of the Old Testament. The rabbies, to rid themselves of this difficulty, had recourse to two expedients. One was, to form, analogically, from biblical roots, derivatives, to the meaning of which, the analogy of the formation would prove a sufficient guide. Thus from verbs occurring only in the conjugation *kal*, they form regularly the *niphal*, *hiphil*, *hophal*, and *hithpael*; also verbal nouns, participles, &c. From abstracts they form concretes, and conversely. There is reason to believe that many of those words are genuine Hebrew, though in the few ancient books extant they do not occur. But whether genuine or not, was of little consequence, as the regular formation rendered them intelligible. Their other expedient was (what, in some degree, is used by writers in every tongue, when in a strait) to adopt words from other languages. The chief resources of the rabbies have been Chaldaic, Arabic, Greek, and Latin: they do not reject entirely the aid of modern tongues. The Grammar of the rabbinical, is that of the ancient Hebrew. The Lexicon of the former contains that of the latter, and a good deal more. To illustrate the difference by a comparison, I hardly think that the rabbinical differs so much from the Hebrew of the Old Testament as the Latin of the 7th and 8th centuries differs from that of the Augustine age. Though the question as proposed by Mr. Gibbon, has no relation to the language of Matthew's Gospel: yet, as it is natural to conclude, (and I am persuaded, is the fact,) that the language spoken by our Lord was that in which Matthew wrote, I have thought it reasonable to take this notice of it, knowing that the slightest suggestions of a writer of eminence, rarely fail to make an impression on some readers.

in a less degree; men not being so easily misled in matters of testimony, as in matters of opinion. The contrary holds, when either the opinion, or the testimony given, is unfavourable to the prejudices of the person who gives it. Such, doubtless, was the case of the ancient Gentile Christians, when they gave a testimony which, in any respect favoured the pretensions of the Nazarenes. Their testimony is itself, at least, a strong presumption of their impartiality, and of the justice of a rival claim. The reverse is the natural presumption in regard to the opinion of a modern disputant, when that opinion serves manifestly to support a favourite tenet, controverted by an adverse sect. This consideration will be found greatly to diminish the weight, if it can be said to have any weight, of what has been advanced on this head, in latter ages, against the uniform suffrage of antiquity.

§ 22. THAT this Gospel was composed by one born a Jew, familiarly acquainted with the opinions, ceremonies, and customs, of his countrymen; that it was composed by one conversant in the sacred writings, and habituated to their idiom; a man of plain sense, but of little or no learning, except what he derived from the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and, finally, that it was the production of a man who wrote seriously, and from conviction; who as, on most occasions, he had been present, had attended closely to the facts and speeches which he related; but who, in

writing, entertained not the most distant view of setting off himself by the relation; we have as strong internal evidence as the nature of the thing will admit; and much stronger than that wherein the mind, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, acquiesces. Now, exactly such a man the Apostle and Evangelist Matthew must have been; of whom, as we have seen, we have an historical proof, quite unexceptionable, that he was the author.

§ 23. THAT this history was primarily intended for the use of his countrymen the Jews, we have, in aid of historical evidence, very strong presumptions, from the tenor of the book itself. Every circumstance is carefully pointed out, which might conciliate the faith of that nation; every unnecessary expression is avoided, which might, in any way, serve to obstruct it. To come to particulars: there was no sentiment relating to the Messiah, with which the Jews were more strongly possessed, than that he must be of the race of Abram, and of the family of David; Matthew, therefore, with great propriety, begins his narrative with the genealogy of Jesus. That he should be born at Bethlehem, in Judea, is another circumstance, in which the learned among the Jews of those times were universally agreed. His birth in that city, with some very memorable circumstances that attended it, this historian has also taken the first opportunity to mention. Those passages in the Prophets, or other sacred books, which either foretell any thing that should happen

to him, or admit an allusive application, or were, in that age, generally understood to be applicable to events which concern the Messiah, are never passed over in silence, by this Evangelist. The fulfilment of prophecy was always to the Jews, convinced of the inspiration of their sacred writings, a principal topic of argument. Accordingly, none of the Evangelists has been more careful than Matthew, that nothing of this kind should be overlooked. And, though the quality I am going to mention, is not always to be discovered in modern translations, none of the sacred penmen has more properly avoided the unnecessary introduction of any term offensive to his countrymen⁵⁶.

§ 24. THAT we find so much of this kind in the Greek, has been urged by some, as an argument, that it is the original of this Gospel, though, in fact, it proves no more, than that it is either the original, or a close translation; for other acknowledged versions can be produced, in which this circumstance is equally observable. In regard to this, I frankly own that the Greek, in my judgment, has not many of those peculiarities which may be called marks of translation. That which might chiefly appear to such a critic, is no other than what might naturally be expected in a Jewish original, on the subject of religion, written in that age and country. The quality I allude to, is the frequent recurrence of the Oriental idiom.

⁵⁶ Ch. i. 11. N.

in which Matthew, I believe, will not be found to abound more than the other Evangelists, Mark, Luke, and John, who, by the acknowledgment of all parties, wrote in Greek. Some other arguments of this kind, as, that the quotations from the Old Testament are generally in the words of the Septuagint, that the words used on certain occasions, by our Lord, are retained and explained, are fully answered by Simon⁵⁷, to whom, that I may not prove tedious, I must refer the reader.

§ 25. THERE is, however, one argument from the language, and but one, that has occurred to my observation, which forms, at least, a presumption that the Greek is a version. Though the sacred writers, in that language, sometimes retain in their narratives, without adding an explanation, a memorable Oriental word, in frequent use among the people, are known to all connected with them, such as *Hosanna*, *Hallelujah*; we never find, in the moral or didactic part, any thing introduced, from a different tongue, which renders the import of a precept unintelligible to those unacquainted with the tongue. Indeed, in the history, the very words spoken (to impress those more strongly who happen to understand them) are, though seldom, sometimes mentioned, but they are always accompanied with an interpretation, that no reader may be at a loss for the meaning. Such are *Ephphatha*, *Talitha cumi*,

⁵⁷ Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. ch. v. &c.

and the exclamation on the cross. But the prohibition of what is criminal, and that under a severe sanction, where the crime itself is expressed in an unknown tongue, and left unexplained, is totally without a parallel in holy writ. Of this we have an example in the words thus rendered in the common version⁵⁸: *Whosoever shall say to his brother, RACA, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, THOU FOOL, shall be in danger of hell fire.* I think, with Dr. Sykes, that *ρακα*, in this place, ought to be understood as an Oriental, and not a Greek word, as well as *ρακα*; for *מרה* *moreh*, is actually such a word, and could not be represented otherwise in the Greek character. The English translators, therefore, had the same reason for rendering the latter clause, *Whosoever shall say Moreh*, that they had for rendering the former clause, *Whosoever shall say Raca*. It is, at least, presumable, that the same caution which led the writer to preserve the original term in one member of this sentence, would lead him also to preserve it in the other, more especially as this is the clause which contains the severest threatening.

Besides, our finding that this word is a term of reproach in the dialect of Palestine, as well as the other, adds greatly to the probability, that it was so understood by the writer. Moreover, if this be interpreted as a Greek word, and rendered *thou fool*, it will coincide with *raca*, *stultus*, *fatuus*,

⁵⁸ Matth. v. 22.

which can hardly be rendered otherwise ; whereas, there is evidently intended here, a gradation in the crimes, as there is a gradation in the punishments. Now, let it be observed, that this manner, in such a case as the present, suits more the excessive scrupulosity of a translator, than the simplicity and plainness of an inspired writer, who means to instruct his readers in every duty, and to warn them against every danger. Did the sacred penmen find it necessary to employ Oriental terms, because those reproachful names had nothing equivalent to them in the Greek language, and consequently, because those who spoke Greek, not being susceptible of the guilt, implied in using those words, were in no danger of incurring the punishment? This is too absurd to be believed by any body. There is no language, ancient or modern, in which abuse may not be uttered; and indignation, contempt, and abhorrence, signified, in the highest degree. In such a case, therefore, it would be unaccountable and unparalleled in an inspired author to adopt terms unintelligible to the people whose language he writes, and leave them unexplained; but this manner is not at all to be wondered at in a translator, especially when we consider how apt the early translators among the Jews were to carry their scruples this way to excess. I had occasion to observe before⁵⁹, that one of the greatest difficulties in translating, is to find words in one language, that perfectly correspond

⁵⁹ Diss. II. Part I. § 4.

to those of another, which relate to manners and sentiments. In most other matters there is, comparatively, but little difficulty. The word *moreh*, here used by the Evangelist, differs only in number from *morim*, the compellation with which Moses and Aaron addressed the people of Israel, when they said⁶⁰, with manifest and indecent passion, as rendered in the English Bible, *Hear, now, YE REBELS*, and were, for their punishment, not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. The word, however, as it is oftener used to imply rebellion against God than against any earthly sovereign; and as it includes disbelief of his word, as well as disobedience to his command, I think better rendered in this place *miscreant*, which is also, like the original term, expressive of the greatest abhorrence and detestation. In this way translated, the gradation of crimes, as well as of punishments, is preserved, and the impropriety avoided, of delivering a moral precept, of consequence to men of all denominations, in words intelligible only to the learned.

Dr. Owen remarks that the Syriac interpreter did not take the word in this sense; for, though he retains *raca* untranslated, he renders *moreh* by a word that signifies *fool*. But this difficulty vanishes on reflecting that the language of Palestine, as has been shown, was not then Syriac; though it contained a considerable mixture of Syrian words. Now, as that interpreter translated from

⁶⁰ Numb. xx. 10.

the Greek, he must have been sensible that *ραξα* was not Greek but Syriac, and that its meaning suited the scope of the passage. It, therefore, needed no translation in a Syriac book. On the contrary, he must have perceived that *μωρε* is a Greek word, a term of reproach, and consequently, in some measure, suiting the scope of the passage. But, if faith is due to our best lexicons, (the Heptaglotton of Castellus, in particular) it is not, in this acceptation, Syriac, though it is both Hebrew and Chaldean. That the Syriac interpreter should, in translating a Greek book, consider *μωρε* as Greek, which he knew not to be Syriac, and should translate it accordingly, is not more surprising than that the Latin, or any other interpreter, should do so. But this is no reason why those who know that the connection which the dialect of Judea had with the ancient Hebrew and Chaldaic, was, at least, not inferior to that which it had with Syriac, should not recur to those tongues, as well as to the latter, for light in doubtful cases. So much for Matthew's language.

§ 26. As the sacred writers, especially the Evangelists, have many qualities in common, so there is something in every one of them, which, if attended to, will be found to distinguish him from the rest. That which principally distinguishes Matthew, is the distinctness and particularity with which he has related many of our Lord's discourses and moral instructions. Of these his sermon on the mount, his charge to the Apostles, his illustrations of the nature of his kingdom, and his

prophecy on mount Olivet, are examples. He has also wonderfully united simplicity and energy in relating the replies of his Master to the cavils of his adversaries. He has, at the same time, his peculiarities in point of diction. Of these I know none more remarkable than the phrase *ἡ Βασιλεια των ουρανων*, *the kingdom, or reign of heaven*, which is used by him about thirty times, and by no other sacred writer. The other Evangelists, in parallel passages, always say *ἡ Βασιλεια του θεου*, *the kingdom, or reign of God*, an expression which occurs only five times in Matthew. Being early called to the apostleship, he was an eye and ear witness of most of the things which he relates. And, though I do not think it was the scope of any of these historians, to adjust their narratives by the precise order of time wherein the events happened; there are some circumstances which incline me to think, that Matthew has approached at least as near that order as any of them. They do not call their works *histories*; and as to the import of the title *ευαγγελιον* commonly given, it is, in this application, well explained by Justin Martyr, a writer of the second century, who makes it equivalent to *απομνημονευματα*, *memorable things, or memoirs*, according to the explanation of this word given by Johnson, which he defines, *An account of transactions familiarly written.*

§ 27. IT has been shown, that we have reason to consider Matthew's Greek Gospel, which we at present possess, as a version from the original, written in the language spoken in Palestine in our

Lord's time, and during the subsistence of the Jewish commonwealth. But as to the translator, nothing but conjecture has ever been advanced by the learned. The obscurity in which the question about the translator lies, can nowise affect the credibility of the fact, that it is a translation. Who ever doubted that the Syriac New Testament, and the old Italic, are translations? Yet the translators are equally unknown with the Greek interpreter of Matthew's Hebrew Gospel. This is oftenest the case with ancient versions; and we have reason to believe that the present is very ancient, it having been made before those freedoms were taken with the original, which have justly brought dishonour on the Nazarene and the Ebionite copies.

§ 28. THAT Matthew's Gospel was the first published, is another opinion, as was hinted already, which rests on the concurrent voice of antiquity, the same foundation with that on which our belief is built that Matthew was the author, and that the language in which he wrote his Gospel, was that kind of Hebrew which was spoken at that time in Judea. Notice was taken of Matthew's Gospel, and of Mark's, very early in the church, and before we find any direct mention of Luke's and of John's. The first who expressly mentions all the four Evangelists, is Irenæus, who mentions them as having written in the same order wherein they appear to have been arranged in the Bible, in his time, and wherein they have continued ever since. Some transcribers have, indeed, affected to arrange

them differently putting the two Apostles before the other two, who were only Evangelists. But they seem to have done this, from an opinion of the comparative rank of the writers, without controverting the order in which the Gospels were written. In the Cambridge manuscript, which is followed by some other manuscripts less considerable, the order is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But Matthew's title to the first place does not appear, in any view of the matter, ever to have been questioned among the ancients. Some, of late, have thought themselves warranted to assign the priority in point of time to the Evangelist Luke. Their reasons for this opinion I shall consider in the preface to that Gospel.



THE

GOSPEL BY MATTHEW.

SECTION I.

THE NATIVITY.

1. **T**HE lineage of Jesus Christ son of David, son
2 of Abraham. Abraham begat Isaac. Isaac
3 begat Jacob. Jacob begat Judah and his broth-
4 ers. Judah had Pharez and Zarah by Tamar.
5 Pharez begat Hezron. Hezron begat Ram.
6 Ram begat Aminadab. Aminadab begat Nah-
7 shon. Nahson begat Salmon. Salmon had
8 Boaz by Rahab. Boaz had Obed by Ruth.
9 Obed begat Jesse. Jesse begat David the king.
10 David the king had Solomon, by her who had
11 been wife of Uriah. Solomon begat Rehoboam.
12 Rehoboam begat Abia. Abia begat Asa. Asa
13 begat Jehoshaphat. Jehoshaphat begat Joram.
- Lu. 3; 23.
Gen. 21; 2.
25; 24; 29;
35; 38; 27.
Ruth 4; 18.
1 Sam. 16; 1.
17; 12. 2
Sam. 12; 24.
1 ch. 3; 10.

CH. I.

SECT. I.

9 *Joram begat Uzziah. Uzziah begat Jotham. Jotham begat Ahaz. Ahaz begat Hezekiah.*
 10 *Hezekiah begat Manasseh. Manasseh begat*
 11 *Amon. Amon begat Josiah. Josiah had Jec-*
oniah and his brothers, about the time of the
 12 *migration into Babylon. After the migration*
into Babylon, Jeconiah begat Salathiel. Salathi-
 13 *el begat Zerubbabel. Zerubbabel begat Abiud.*
Abiud begat Eliakim. Eliakim begat Azor.
 14 *Azor begat Zadoc. Zadoc begat Achim. Achim*
 15 *begat Eliud. Eliud begat Eleazer. Eleazer*
 16 *begat Matthan. Matthan begat Jacob. Jacob be-*
gat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was
 17 *born Jesus, who is called¹ Messiah. So all the*
generations from Abraham to David are four-
teen; from David till the migration into Baby-
lon fourteen; and from the migration into
Babylon to the² Messiah fourteen.

Lu. 1; 26.

18 *NOW the birth of Jesus Christ happened*
thus: Mary his mother had been espoused to Jo-
seph; but before they came together, she proved
 19 *to be with child by the Holy Spirit. Joseph her*
husband being a worthy man, and unwilling to
 20 *expose her, intended to divorce her privately. But*
while he was thinking upon this, a messenger of
the Lord appearing to him in a dream, said, Jo-
seph, son of David, scruple not to take home
Mary thy wife; for her pregnancy is from the

¹ Or Christ.² Or Christ.

SECT. I.

CH. 2.

21 Holy Spirit. And she shall bear a son, whom
 thou shalt call Jesus ; for he will save his people Acts, 4 ; 12.
 22 from their sins. *In all this, what the Lord had*
 23 *spoken by the Prophet was verified, " Behold the*
" Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, who shall Isa. 7 ; 14.
" be called Immanuel ;" which signifies God with
 24 *us. When Joseph awoke, he did as the mes-*
senger of the Lord had commanded him, and
 25 *took home his wife ; but knew her not, until she*
had brought forth her first-born son, whom he
named Jesus³.

II. *AFTER the birth of Jesus, at Bethlehem of* Lu. 2 ; 4.
Judea, in the reign of king Herod, certain
eastern magians⁴ came to Jerusalem, and in-
 2 *quired, Where is the new-born king of the*
Jews ; for we have seen his star in the east
country, and are come to do him homage ?
 3 *King Herod hearing this, was alarmed, and all*
 4 *Jerusalem with him. And having assembled all*
the chief priests and the scribes of the people, he
demanded of them where the Messiah should be
 5 *born ? They answered, At Bethlehem of Ju-*
dea ; for thus it is written by the Prophet,
 6 *" And thou Bethlehem, in the canton of Judah,* Mic. 5 ; 2.
" art not the least illustrious among the cities Jo. 7 ; 42.
" of Judah ; for out of thee shall come a ruler,
" who will govern my people Israel."
 7 *Then Herod having secretly called the ma-*
gians, procured from them exact information
concerning the time of the star's appearing.

³ That is, Saviour.⁴ A sect of Philosophers in Asia.

CH. 2.

SECT. I.

8 *And sending them to Bethlehem, he said, Go, make an exact inquiry about the child; and when ye have found him, bring me word, that*
 9 *I may also go and pay him homage. Having heard the king, they departed: and lo! the star which had appeared to them in the east country, moved before them, till it came and*
 10 *stood over the place where the child was. When they again saw the star, they rejoiced exceed-*
 11 *ingly. And being come into the house, they found the child with Mary his mother; and prostrating themselves, did him homage. Then opening their caskets, they offered, as presents,*
 12 *gold, frankincense, and myrrh. And being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they went home another way.*

Ps. 72; 9.

13 *WHEN they were gone, a messenger of the Lord appearing to Joseph in a dream, said, Arise, take the child, with his mother, and flee into Egypt; and remain there till I acquaint thee; for Herod will seek the child*
 14 *to destroy him. Accordingly he arose, took the child, with his mother, and withdrew by night into Egypt, where he continued until the*
 15 *death of Herod; so that what the Lord had spoken by the Prophet was verified, "Out of*
 16 *"Egypt I recalled my son."*

Nu. 23; 22.

Hos. 11; 1.

16 *Then Herod, finding that he had been deceived by the magians, was highly incensed, and dispatched emissaries, who slew, by his order, all the male children in Betklehem, and in all its territory, from those entering the second year.*

SECT. II.

GH. S.

down to the time whereof he had procured exact
 17 information from the magians. Then was the
 18 word of Jeremiah the Prophet verified, "*A* Jer. 31; 15.
 "cry was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and
 "weeping, and bitter complaint, Rachel bewail-
 "ing her children, and refusing to be comforted,
 "because they are not."
 19 When Herod was dead, a messenger of the
 Lord appearing in a dream to Joseph in Egypt,
 20 said, Arise, take the child, with his mother, and
 go into the land of Israel; for they are dead
 21 who sought his life. Accordingly, he arose, took
 the child, with his mother, and went to the land
 22 of Israel; but hearing that Archelaus had suc-
 ceeded his father Herod in the throne of Judea,
 he was afraid to return thither; and being
 warned in a dream, retired into the district of
 23 Galilee, and resided in a city named Nazareth;
 thereby verifying the declaration of the Prophet
 [concerning Jesus,] that he should be called a
 Nazarene.

 SECTION II.

THE BAPTISM.

III. *IN* those days appeared John the Baptist, who
 2 *cried* in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Re-
 3 form, for the reign of heaven approacheth. For
 .this is he of whom the prophet Isaiah speaketh in
 these words, "The voice of one proclaiming" Isa. 40; 3.

Mar. 1; 2.
 Lu. 3; 1.
 Jo. 1; 6.
 ch. 4; 17.
 ch. 10; 7.

CH. 3.

SECT. II.

*in the wilderness, "Prepare a way for⁵ the
"Lord, make for him a straight passage."*

4 *Now John wore raiment of camel's hair with a
leathern girdle about his waist; and his food
5 was locusts and wild honey. Then Jerusalem
and all Judea, and all the country along the
6 Jordan resorted to him, and were baptized by
him in Jordan, confessing their sins.*

7 *But he seeing many Pharisees and Sadducees
coming to him to receive baptism, said to them,
Offspring of vipers, who hath prompted you to
8 flee from the impending vengeance? Produce
9 then the proper fruit of reformation; and pre-
sume not to say within yourselves, 'We have*

Jo. 8; 39.

*'Abraham for our father,' for I assure you that
of these stones God can raise children to Abra-
10 ham. And even now the axe lieth at the root
of the trees; every tree, therefore, which pro-
duceth not good fruit is felled, and turned into*

ch. 7; 19.

*11 fewel. I indeed baptize you in water, that ye
may reform; but he who cometh after me is
mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy
to carry. He will baptize you in the Holy
12 Spirit and fire. His winnowing shovel is in his
hand; and he will thoroughly cleanse his
grain; he will gather his wheat into the gran-
ary, and consume the chaff in unquenchable fire.*

Mar. 1; 8.
Lu. 3; 16.
Jo. 1; 26.
Acts, 1; 5.

13 *THEN came Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to
14 be baptized by John. But John excused himself*

Mar. 1; 9.
Lu. 3; 21.

⁵ In the Hebrew of Isaiah, *Jehovah*.

SECT. II.

CH. 4.

saying, It is I who need to be baptized by
 15 thee ; and thou comest to me ! *Jesus answering
 said unto him, Permit this at present ; for thus
 ought we to ratify every institution. Then*
 16 *John acquiesced. Jesus being baptized, no
 sooner arose out of the water, than heaven was
 opened to him ; and the Spirit of God appear-
 ed, descending like a dove, and lighting upon*
 17 *him : while a voice from heaven proclaimed,*
 This is my beloved Son in whom I delight.

Jo. 1 ; 37.
 ch. 17 ; 5.
 Lu. 9 ; 35.
 2 Pet. 1 ; 17.

IV. *THEN was Jesus conducted by the Spirit* Mar. 1 ; 12.
into the wilderness, to be tempted by the⁶ devil. Lu. 4 ; 1.
 2 *And after fasting forty days and forty nights,*
 3 *he was hungry. Whereupon the tempter, ac-
 costing him, said, If thou be a Son of God,*
 command that these stones become loaves.
 4 *Jesus answering said, It is written, “ Man* Deu. 8 ; 3.
 “ liveth not by bread only, but by every thing
 5 “ which God is pleased to appoint.” *Then the
 devil conveyed him into the holy city, and having
 placed him upon the battlement of the temple,*
 6 *said to him, If thou be a Son of God, throw
 thyself down ; for it is written, “ He will give* Ps. 91 ; 11.
 “ his⁷ angels the charge of thee : they shall
 “ uphold thee in their arms, lest thou dash thy
 7 “ foot against a stone.” *Jesus again answered,*
 It is written, “ Thou shalt not put⁸ the Lord
 8 “ thy God to the proof.” *Again the devil took
 him up a very high mountain, whence he showed*

⁶ Traducer.⁷ Messengers.⁸ Jehovah.

CH. 4.

SECT. II.

him all the kingdoms of the world in their glory, and said to him, All these will I give thee, if thou wilt prostrate thyself and worship me.

Deu. 6 ; 13.
10 ; 20.
1 Sam. 7 ; 3.

10 *Jesus answered, Satan⁹, begone ; for it is written, " Thou shalt worship the¹⁰ Lord thy God,*
11 *" and shalt serve him only." Then the devil leaving him, angels came and ministered to him.*

Mar. 1 ; 14.
Lu. 4 ; 14.
Jo. 4 ; 43.

12 *NOW Jesus hearing that John was imprisoned, retired into Galilee ; and having left Nazareth, resided at Capernaum, a seaport in the confines of Zebulun and Naphtali, thereby verifying the words of Isaiah the Prophet ;*

Isa. 9 ; 1.

15 *" The canton of Zebulun and the canton of " Naphtali, situate on the Jordan near the sea,*
16 *" Galilee of the nations ; the people who abode " in darkness, saw a great light, and on those " who inhabited a region of the shades of death,*
17 *" light hath arisen." From that time Jesus began to proclaim, saying, Reform, for the reign of heaven approacheth.*

ch. 3 ; 2.
ch. 10 ; 7.
Mar. 1 ; 16.
Lu. 5 ; 1.
Jo. 1 ; 35.

18 *Then walking by the sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon named Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a drag into the sea, for they*
19 *were fishers. And he said to them, Come with me, and I will make you fishers of men.*
20 *Immediately they left the nets and followed him.*
21 *Passing on he saw other two brothers, James Son of Zebedee and John his brother, in the bark with their father Zebedee, mending their*
22 *nets, and he called them. They immediately*

⁹ Adversary.

¹⁰ Jehovah.

SECT. III.

CH. 5.

leaving the bark and their father, followed him.

- 23 Then Jesus went over all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the glad tidings of the reign, and curing every sort of dis-
- 24 ease and malady among the people. And his fame spread through all Syria, and they brought to him all their sick, seized and tormented with various distempers, demoniacs, and lunatics, and paralytics, and he healed them.
- 25 And vast multitudes followed him from Galilee, from ¹¹ Decapolis, from Jerusalem, from Judea, and from the banks of the Jordan.

ch. 9; 35.
Mar. 1; 39.
Lu. 4; 15,
44.

Mar. 1; 34.

Mar. 3; 7.
Lu. 6; 17.

SECTION III.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

V. JESUS seeing so great a confluence, repaired to a mountain, and having sat down, his disciples came to him. Then breaking silence, he taught them, saying,

- 3 HAPPY the poor who repine not; for the
- 4 kingdom of heaven is theirs! Happy they who
- 5 mourn; for they shall receive consolation!
- 6 Happy the meek; for they shall inherit the
- 7 land! Happy they who hunger and thirst for
- righteousness; for they shall be satisfied! Happy the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy!

Lu. 6; 20.
Isa. 61; 3.
Ps. 37; 11.
Isa. 65; 13.

¹¹ A district of ten cities.

CH. 5.

SECT. III.

- Ps. 24 ; 3. 8 Happy the clean in heart ; for they shall see
 1 Pet. 3 ; 14. 9 God ! Happy the peacemakers ; for they shall
 10 be called sons of God ! Happy they who suffer
 persecution on account of righteousness ; for
 1 Pet. 4 ; 14. 11 the kingdom of heaven is theirs ! Happy shall
 ye be, when men shall revile and prosecute you,
 and, on my account, accuse you falsely of eve-
 12 ry evil thing ! Rejoice and exult ; for great is
 your reward in heaven ; for thus the Prophets
 were persecuted who were before you.
- Mar. 9 ; 49. 13 YE are the salt of the earth. If the salt be-
 Lu. 14 ; 34. come insipid, how shall its saltness be restored ?
 It is thenceforth fit only to be cast out, and
 14 trodden by men. Ye are the light of the world.
 A city situate on a mountain must be conspicu-
 Mar. 4 ; 21. 15 ous. A lamp is lighted to be put, not under
 Lu. 8 ; 16. a corn-measure, but on a stand, that it may
 — 11 ; 33. shine to all the family. Thus, let your light
 1 Pet. 2 ; 12. 16 shine before men, that they seeing your good
 actions, may glorify your Father who is in
 heaven.
- 17 Think not that I am come to subvert the law
 or the prophets. I am come not to subvert,
 Lu. 16 ; 17. 18 but to ratify. For verily I say unto you,
 Heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one
 iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish without
 Ja. 2 ; 10. 19 attaining its end. Whosoever, therefore, shall
 violate, or teach others to violate, were it the
 least of these commandments, shall be in no
 esteem in the reign of heaven ; but whosoever
 shall practise and teach them, shall be highly

CH. 5.

SECT. III.

20 esteemed in the reign of heaven. For I warn you, that unless your righteousness excel the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall never enter the kingdom of heaven.

21 YE have heard that it was said to the an- Ex. 20; 13.
cients, "Thou shalt not commit murder; for Deut. 5; 17.
"whosoever committeth murder shall be ob-
22 "noxious to the judges." But I say unto you,
'Whosoever is angry with his brother unjustly,
'shall be obnoxious to the judges; whoever
'shall call him fool, shall be obnoxious to the
'council; but whosoever shall call him mis-
23 'creant, shall be obnoxious to hell-fire.' There-
fore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there
recollect that thy brother hath ground to com-
24 plain of thee; leave there thy gift before the
altar: first go and procure reconciliation with
25 thy brother, then come, and offer thy gift. Com- Lu. 12; 58.
pound betimes with thy creditor, while ye are
on the road together; lest the creditor consign
thee to the judge; and the judge consign thee
to the officer, and thou be thrown into prison.
26 Verily I say unto thee; thou wilt not be re-
leased until thou hast discharged the last
farthing.

27 YE have heard that it was said, "Thou shalt Ex. 20; 14.
28 "not commit adultery." But I say unto you, Deut. 5; 18.
'Whosoever looketh on another man's wife,
'in order to cherish impure desire, hath al-
'ready committed adultery with her in his
'heart.' Therefore, if thy right eye insnare ch. 18; 8.
29 thee, pluck it out, and throw it away: it is Mar. 9; 43.

CH. 5.

SECT. III.

better for thee to lose one of thy members,
than that thy whole body be cast into hell.

30 And if thy right hand insnare thee, cut it off,
and throw it away: it is better for thee to lose
one of thy members, than that thy whole body
be cast into hell.

Deut. 24; 1. 31 - It hath been said, "Whosoever would dis-
"miss his wife, let him give her a writ of di-

ch. 19; 7. 32 "vorce." But I say unto you, 'Whosoever
Lu. 16; 18. 'shall dismiss his wife, except for whoredom,
'is the occasion of her becoming an adulteress;
1 Cor. 7; 10- 'and whosoever marrieth her that is dismissed,
'committeth adultery.'

Ex. 20; 7. 33 Again, ye have heard that it was said to the
Lev. 19; 12. ancients, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself,
Deut. 5; 11. "but shalt perform thy oaths to the Lord."
Ja. 5; 12.

34 But I say unto you, 'Swear not at all; neither
35 'by heaven, for it is God's throne, nor by the
'earth, for it is his footstool; neither shalt
'thou swear by Jerusalem, for it is the city of
36 'the great king; nor by thy head, because
'thou canst not make one hair white or black.'

37 But let your yes be yes, your no, no; for what-
ever exceedeth these, proceedeth from evil.

Ex. 21; 24. 38 Ye have heard that it was said, "Eye for

Lev. 24; 20. 39 "eye, and tooth for tooth." But I say unto
Deu. 19; 21. you, Resist not the injurious. But if any one
Lu. 6; 27- strike thee on the right cheek, turn to him also

1 Cor. 6; 7. 40 the left. Whoever will sue thee for thy coat,
41 let him have thy mantle likewise. And if a

Deut. 15; 7- 42 man constrain thee to go one mile with him,
42 go two. Give to him that asketh thee; and

CH. 6.

SECT. III.

him that would borrow from thee, put not away.

43 Ye have heard that it was said, "Thou shalt Lev. 19; 15.
"love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy."

44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless Ro. 12; 20.
them who curse you; do good to them who

45 hate you; and pray for them who arraign and
prosecute you; that ye may be children of

your Father in heaven, who maketh his sun
arise on bad and good, and sendeth rain on just

46 and unjust. For if ye love them only who
love you, what reward can ye expect? Do

47 not even the publicans so? And if ye show
courtesy to your friends only, wherein do ye

48 excel? Do not even the pagans as much? Be Eph. 5; 1.
ye therefore perfect, as your Father who is in

heaven is perfect.

VI. TAKE heed that ye perform not your religious duties before men, in order to be observed by them; otherwise ye will obtain no reward from your Father who is in heaven.

2 When, therefore, thou givest alms, do not proclaim it by sound of trumpet, as the hypocrites do, in the assemblies and in the streets; that they may be extolled by men. Verily, I say unto you they have received their reward.

3 But thou, when thou givest alms, let not thy

4 left hand know what thy right hand doth; that thine alms may be in secret; and thy Father,

to whom nothing is secret, will himself recompense thee.

5 And when thou prayest, be not like the hypo-

crites, who affect to pray standing in the assemblies, and at the corners of the streets, that men may observe them. Verily I say unto

6 you, they have received their reward. But thou, when thou wouldst pray, retire to thy closet; and, having shut the door, pray to thy Father; and thy Father, to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will re-

Eccles. 5; 2.
Ecclus. 7;
14.

7 compensate thee. And in prayer, talk not at random, as the pagans, who think that using many words will procure them acceptance.

8 Imitate them not, for your Father knoweth what things ye want, before ye ask him.

Lu. 11; 2.

9 Thus, therefore, pray ye: 'Our Father, who

10 'art in heaven, thy name be hallowed; thy

'reign come; thy will be done upon the

11 'earth, as it is in heaven; give us to-day our

12 'daily bread; forgive us our debts as we for-

13 'give our debtors; and abandon us not to

'temptation, but preserve us from evil. [For

'thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the

14 'glory for ever. Amen.'] For, if ye forgive

others their trespasses, your heavenly Father

15 will also forgive you: but if ye forgive not

others their trespasses, neither will your Father

forgive your trespasses.

Ecclus. 28; 1.
ch. 18; 35.
Mar. 11; 25.
Ja. 2; 13.

16 Moreover, when ye fast, look not dismal, as the hypocrites, who disfigure their faces, that men may observe that they fast. Verily I say

17 unto you, they have received their reward. But

thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and

18 wash thy face; that thy fasting may not appear

to men, but to thy Father; and thy Father, to

whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, will recompense thee.

- 19 **A**MASS not for yourselves treasure upon the earth, where moths or rust may consume it, Lu. 12; 33.
 20 or thieves breaking in may steal it. But provide for yourselves treasure in heaven, where are neither moths nor rust to consume it, nor
 21 thieves to break in and steal it. For where Lu. 11; 34.
 22 your treasure is, your heart will also be. The lamp of the body is the eye. If, therefore, thine eye be sound, thy whole body will be
 23 enlightened: but if thine eye be distempered, thy whole body will be dark. And if even the light which is in thee be darkness; how great will the darkness be?
- 24 **A** man cannot serve two masters; for either Lu. 16; 13.
 he will hate one, and love the other; or at least will attend one, and neglect the other.
- 25 **Y**e cannot serve God and¹² Mammon. Therefore I charge you; be not anxious about your Ps. 55; 22.
 life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; Lu. 12; 22.
 nor about your body, what ye shall wear. Is not life a greater gift than food; and the body
 26 than raiment? Observe the fowls of heaven. They neither sow nor reap. They have no storehouse: but your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye much more valuable than
 27 they? Besides; which of you can by his anx-
 28 iety prolong his life one hour? And why are ye anxious about raiment? Mark the lilies of the field. How do they grow? They toil not:

¹² *Riches.*

CH. 7.

SECT. III.

29 they spin not. Yet I affirm that even Solomon,
 in all his glory, was not equally adorned with
 30 one of these. If then God so array the herb-
 age which to-day is in the field, and to-morrow
 will be cast into the oven; will he not much
 31 more array you, O ye distrustful! Therefore
 say not anxiously, as the heathens do, What
 shall we eat; or what shall we drink; or
 32 wherewith shall we be clothed? For your
 heavenly Father knoweth that ye need all
 33 these things. But seek first the kingdom of
 God and the righteousness required by him;
 and all these things shall be superadded to you.
 34 Be not then anxious about the morrow: the
 morrow will be anxious about itself. Sufficient
 for every day is its own trouble.

Lu. 6; 37.

Ro. 2; 1.

14; 4.

Mar. 4; 24.

Lu. 6; 41.

Ja. 4; 12.

VII. JUDGE not, that ye be not judged; for as ye
 2 judge, ye shall be judged; and with the meas-
 3 ure wherewith ye give, ye shall receive. And
 why observest thou the mote in thy brother's
 eye, but art insensible of the thorn in thine
 4 own eye? Or how darest thou say to thy
 brother, 'Let me take the mote out of thine
 eye;' thou who hast a thorn in thine own?
 5 Hypocrite, first take the thorn out of thine own
 eye; then thou wilt see to take the mote out of
 thy brother's eye.
 6 Give not things holy to dogs, and cast not
 your pearls before swine, lest they trample
 them under foot, or turn upon you and tear you.
 7 Ask, and ye shall obtain; seek, and ye shall
 find; knock, and the door shall be opened to

ch. 13; 23.

SECT. III.

CH. 7.

- 8 you. For whosoever asketh, obtaineth; who- Mar. 11; 24.
 soever seeketh, findeth; and to every one who Lu. 11; 9
 9 knocketh, the door is opened. Who amongst Jo. 16; 24.
 you men would give his son a stone, when he Ja. 1; 5.
 10 asketh bread; or a serpent, when he asketh a
 11 fish? If ye then, though evil, can give good
 things to your children, how much more will
 your Father who is in heaven, give good things
 to them that ask him?
- 12 Whatsoever ye would that others do to you, Lu. 6; 31.
 do ye also to them; for this is the law and the Lu. 13; 24.
 13 Prophets. Enter through the strait gate; for
 wide is the gate of perdition, broad is the way
 leading thither; and many are they who enter
 14 by it. But how strait is the gate of life; how
 narrow the way leading thither; and how few
 are they who find it!
- 15 Beware of false teachers who come to you
 in the garb of sheep, while inwardly they are
 16 ravenous wolves. By their fruits ye shall Lu. 6; 43.
 discover them. Are grapes gathered from
 17 thorns; or figs from thistles? Every good tree
 yieldeth good fruit; and every evil tree evil
 18 fruit. A good tree cannot yield evil fruit, nor
 19 an evil tree good fruit. Every tree which ch. 3; 10.
 yieldeth not good fruit is felled, and turned
 20 into fuel. Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall
 discover them.
- 21 Not every one who saith unto me, Master,
 master, shall enter the kingdom of heaven; ch. 25; 11.
 but he that doth the will of my Father who is Lu. 6; 46.
 22 in heaven. Many will say to me on that day, Acts, 19; 13.
 'Master, master, have we not taught in thy

Ro. 2; 13.

Ja. 1; 22.

Lu. 13; 27.

‘ name, and in thy name expelled demons; and
23 ‘ in thy name performed many miracles?’ To
whom I will declare, ‘ I never knew you. De-
‘ part from me ye who practise iniquity.’

6; 47.

24 Therefore, whosoever heareth these my
precepts, and doth them, I will compare to a
prudent man, who built his house upon the
25 rock. For although the rain descended, and
the rivers overflowed, and the winds blew and
beat upon that house, it fell not, because it
26 was founded upon the rock. But whosoever
heareth these my precepts, and doth them not,
shall be compared to a fool, who built his
27 house upon the sand. For when the rain
descended, and the rivers overflowed, and the
winds blew, and dashed against that house, it
fell, and great was its ruin.

Mar. 1; 22.

Lu. 4; 32.

28 *WHEN* Jesus had ended this discourse, the
people were astonished at his manner of teach-
29 *ing*: for he taught as one who had authority,
and not as the scribes.

SECTION IV.

SEVERAL MIRACLES.

VIII. *JESUS* being come down from the mountain,
2 followed by a great multitude, a leper came,
who prostrating himself before him, said, *Sir*,
3 if thou wilt, thou canst cleanse me. *Jesus*
stretched out his hand and touched him, saying,

Mar. 1; 40.

Lu. 5; 12.

SECT. IV.

CH. 8.

- I will ; be thou cleansed. *Immediately he was*
 4 *cured of his leprosy. Then Jesus said to him,*
 See thou tell nobody ; but go, show thyself to Lev. 14 ; 2.
 the priest, and make the oblation prescribed
 by Moses, for notifying [the cure] to the
 people.
- 5 *Having entered Capernaum, a centurion*¹³ Lu. 7 ; 1.
 6 *costed him with this request. Sir, my man-ser-*
 vant lieth sick at home, exceedingly afflicted
 7 with a palsy. *Jesus answered, I will go and*
 8 *cure him. The centurion replying, said, Sir, I*
 have not deserved that thou shouldst come
 under my roof ; only say the word, and my ser-
 9 vant will be healed. For even I, who am un-
 der command myself, having soldiers under
 me, say to one, ‘Go,’ and he goeth ; to
 another, ‘Come,’ and he cometh ; and to my
 10 servant, ‘Do this,’ and he doth it. *Jesus hear-*
ing this, was astonished, and said to those who
followed, Verily, I say unto you, not even in
 11 *Israel have I found so great faith. But I* Mal. 1 ; 11.
 assure you, that many will come from the
 east and from the west, and will be placed
 at table with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,
 12 in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of
 the kingdom shall be thrust out into darkness,
 where will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.
 13 *Then Jesus said to the centurion, Go home ; be*
 it to thee according to thy faith. *That instant*
his servant was cured.
- 14 *Then Jesus having entered Peter’s house, saw* Mar. 1 ; 29.
 15 *his wife’s mother lying sick of a fever : and* Lu. 4 ; 38.

¹³ A Roman officer, who had the command of 100 soldiers.

CH. 8.

SECT. IV.

having touched her hand, the fever left her ; whereupon she arose and entertained him.

Mar. 1 ; 32.

16 *In the evening, they presented to him many demoniacs ; and he expelled the spirits with a*

Lu. 4 ; 40.
Is. 53 ; 4.

17 *word, and cured all the sick ; thus verifying the saying of the Prophet Isaiah, " He hath " himself carried off our infirmities and borne " our distresses."*

18 *Jesus seeing himself crowded on all sides,*

Lu. 6 ; 57.

19 *gave orders to pass to the opposite shore. Meantime a scribe accosted him, saying, Rabbi, I will*
20 *follow thee whithersoever thou goest. Jesus answered, The foxes have caverns, and the birds of the air have places of shelter, but the Son of Man hath not where to repose his head.*

Lu. 9 ; 59.

21 *Another, one of his disciples, said to him, Master, permit me to go first, and bury my father.*
22 *Jesus answered, Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead.*

23 *THEN entering the bark, his disciples followed him. Soon after there arose in the sea so*

Mar. 4 ; 57.

24 *great a tempest, that the bark was covered with*

Lu. 8 ; 23.

25 *the billows. But he being asleep, his disciples came and waked him, saying, Save us, Master,*

26 *we perish. He answered, Why are ye timorous, O ye distrustful ? Then he arose, and having commanded the winds and the sea, a great*
27 *calm ensued ; insomuch, that every one exclaimed with admiration, What personage is this, whom even the winds and the sea obey !*

Mar. 5 ; 1.

28 *When he was come to the other side, into the*

SECT. IV.

CH. 9.

country of the Gadarenes, there met him two
 29 demoniacs, issuing out of the monuments, so fu-
 rious, that nobody durst pass that way. These
 instantly cried, saying, What hast thou to do
 with us, Jesus, Son of God? Art thou come
 30 hither to torment us before the time? Now
 there was feeding at some distance a great herd
 31 of swine. And the fiends besought him, saying,
 If thou expel us, permit us to go into the herd
 32 of swine. He answered, Go. And when they
 were cast out, they went into the swine; on
 which the whole herd rushed down a precipice
 33 into the sea, and perished in the waters. Then
 the herdsmen fled into the city, and reported
 every thing, and what had happened to the de-
 34 moniacs. Presently the whole city went out to
 meet Jesus, and having seen him, entreated him
 to depart out of their territory.

IX. Then having gone aboard the bark, he re-
 2 passed, and went to his own city; where they
 brought to him a paralytic, laid upon a bed. Mar. 2; 5.
Lu. 5; 18.
 Jesus perceiving their faith, said to the paralytic,
 Son, take courage, thy sins are forgiven thee.
 3 Whereupon some of the scribes said within Lu. 7; 48.
 4 themselves, 'This man blasphemeth.' But Jesus
 knowing their sentiments, said, Why do ye
 5 harbour evil thoughts? which is easier; to say,
 'Thy sins are forgiven;' or to say [with ef-
 6 fect,] 'Arise and walk.' But that ye may
 know that the Son of Man hath power upon
 the earth to forgive sins, Arise (said he then to
 the paralytic,) take up thy bed and go home.
 7 Accordingly he arose, and went home. And the

CH. 9.

SECT. IV.

8 *people saw and wondered, glorifying God, who had given such power to men.*

Mar. 2 ; 14.

Lu. 5 ; 27.

9 *As Jesus departed thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the toll-office ; to whom he said, Follow me. And he arose and followed him.*

Mar. 2 ; 15.

Lu. 5 ; 29.

10 *Afterwards Jesus, being at table in a house, many publicans and sinners came, and placed*
 11 *themselves with him and his disciples. Some Pharisees observing this, said to his disciples, Why doth your teacher eat with publicans and*
 12 *sinners ? Jesus hearing them, answered, The*
 13 *whole need not a physician, but the sick. Go, therefore, and learn what this meaneth, " I re-*
 " *quire humanity, and not sacrifice : " for I*
 14 *came to call, not the righteous, but sinners [to repentance.]*

Hos. 6 ; 6.
ch. 12 ; 7.

1 Tim. 1 ; 15.

14 *Then John's disciples accosting him, said,*
 We and the Pharisees often fast : why do thy
 15 *disciples never fast ? Jesus answered, Do the*
bridemen mourn, while the bridegroom is with
them ? But the time will come when the bride-
groom shall be taken from them, and then they
 16 *will fast. Nobody mendeth an old garment with*
undressed cloth ; else the patch itself teareth
the garment, and maketh a greater rent.
 17 *Neither do people put new wine into old*
leathern bottles ; otherwise the bottles burst :
and thus, both the wine is spilt, and the bottles
are rendered useless. But they put new wine
into new bottles, and both are preserved.

Mar. 2 ; 18.
Lu. 5 ; 33.

Mar. 5 ; 22.

18 *While he was speaking, a ruler came, and prostrating himself, said, My daughter is by*

SECT. IV.

CH. 9.

this time dead; but come, and lay thy hand
 19 upon her, and she will revive. *And Jesus*
arose, and, as he followed him, with his disci-
 20 *ples, a woman, who had been twelve years af-*
flicted with a bloody issue, coming behind,
 21 *touched the tuft of his mantle; for she said*
within herself, 'If I but touch his mantle, I shall
 22 *'recover.'* *Jesus turning about, saw her, and*
said, Daughter, take courage, thy faith hath
cured thee. And the woman was well from that
instant.

Lu. 8; 41.

Mar. 5; 25.
Lu. 8; 43.

23 *Being come into the ruler's house, and seeing*
the players on the flute, with the crowd making
 24 *a bustle, he said to them, Withdraw, for the*
damsel is not dead, but asleep. And they de-
 25 *rided him: But when the people were put out,*
he entered, and having taken her by the hand,
 26 *the damsel arose. Now the fame of this action*
spread through all that country.

Mar. 5; 33.
Lu. 8; 51.

27 *When Jesus departed thence, two blind men*
followed him, crying, Son of David, have pity
 28 *upon us. Being come into the house, the blind*
men approached: and Jesus said to them, Do
ye believe that I can do this? They answered,
 29 *Yes, Master. Then he touched their eyes, say-*
ing, Be it unto you according to your faith.
 30 *Immediately their eyes were opened. And*
Jesus strictly charging them, said, Take care
 31 *that nobody know it. But being departed, they*
spread his fame through all that country.

32 *They were scarcely gone when a dumb de-*
 33 *moniac was presented to him. The demon*

Lu. 11; 14.
ch. 12; 22.

CH. 10.

SECT. V.

being expelled, the dumb spake, and the people wondered saying, Nothing like this was ever seen in Israel. *But the Pharisees said,* He expelleth the demons by the prince of the demons.

 SECTION V.

THE CHARGE TO THE APOSTLES.

Mar. 6 ; 6. 35 *THEN* Jesus went through all the cities and
Lu. 13 ; 22. villages, teaching in their synagogues, and pro-
claiming the glad tidings of the reign, and cur-
ring every disease and every malady among the
Mar. 6 ; 34. 36 people. But when he saw the multitudes he
had compassion upon them, because they were
scattered and exposed, like a flock without a
Lu. 10 ; 2. 37 shepherd. Then he said to his disciples, The
harvest is plentiful, but the reapers are few :
38 entreat, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that
he would send labourers to reap it.

Mar. 3 ; 15. X. *And having called to him his twelve disciples,*
Lu. 9 ; 1. *he gave them power to expel unclean spirits,*
Lu. 6 ; 13. *and to cure diseases and maladies of every*
2 *kind. Now these are the names of the twelve*
Apostles¹⁴. The first Simon, called Peter, and
Andrew his brother, James, son of Zebedee, and
3 *John his brother, Philip and Bartholomew,*
Thomas and Matthew the Publican, James son
of Alpheus, and Lebbeus, surnamed Thaddeus,
4 *Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, he*

¹⁴ Missionaries.

SECT. V.

CH. 10.

5 *who betrayed him. These twelve Jesus commissioned, instructing them, and saying,*

Go not away to the Gentiles, nor enter a Sa- Acts, 13 ; 46.
 6 maritan city ; but go directly to the lost sheep Lu. 10 ; 9.
 7 of the stock of Israel. And as ye go, proclaim,
 8 saying, 'The reign of heaven approacheth.' Heal
 the sick ; cleanse lepers, expel demons ; freely
 9 ye have received, freely give. Put not gold, or
 10 silver, or brass in your girdles ; carry no scrip, Mar. 6 ; 8.
 no spare coats, shoes, or staves ; for the work- Lu. 9 ; 3.
 man is worthy of his maintenance. Lu. 10 ; 7.
 1 Tim. 5 ;
 18.

11 And whatever city or village ye enter, in-
 quire what person of worth dwelleth there ;
 and abide with him until ye leave the place.

12 When ye enter the house, salute the family.

13 If the family be worthy, the peace ye wish
 them, shall come upon them : if they be not
 worthy, it shall rebound upon yourselves.

14 Wheresoever they will not receive you, nor
 regard your words, in departing that house or
 15 city, shake the dust off your feet. Verily I say Acts, 13 ;
 unto you, the condition of Sodom and Gomor- 51.
 rah shall be more tolerable on the day of judg- Lu. 10 ; 3.
 ment, than the condition of that city.

16 Behold ! I send you forth as sheep amidst
 wolves. Be, therefore, prudent as the serpents,
 17 and harmless as the doves. But be upon your ch. 24 ; 9.
 guard with men ; for they will deliver you to
 councils, and scourge you in their synagogues ;

18 and ye shall be brought before governours and Mar. 13 ; 11.
 kings, on my account, to bear testimony to Lu. 12 ; 11.
 19 them, and to the Gentiles. But when they
 deliver you up, be not anxious how, or what

CH. 10.

SECT. V.

ye shall speak; for what ye should speak shall
 20 be suggested to you in that moment. For it
 shall not be ye that shall speak; but the Spirit
 21 of my Father who will speak by you. Then
 the brother will consign the brother to death;
 and the father the child; and children will
 arise against their parents, and procure their
 22 death. And for my name ye shall be hated
 universally. But the man who persevereth to
 the end, shall be saved.

23 Therefore, when they persecute you in one
 city, flee to another, for verily I say unto you,
 ye shall not have gone through the cities of
 24 Israel, ere the Son of Man be come. A disci-
 ple is not above his teacher, nor a servant
 25 above his master. It is enough for the disci-
 ple to be as his teacher, and for the servant to
 be as his master. If they have called the
 master of the house Beelzebub, how much
 more will they call his domestics?

26 Therefore fear them not; for there is noth-
 ing hidden that shall not be detected; nothing
 27 secret that shall not be known. What I tell
 you in the dark, publish in the light; and what
 is whispered in your ear, proclaim from the
 28 house tops. And fear not them who kill the
 body, but cannot kill the soul; fear rather him
 who can destroy both soul and body in hell
 29 Are not two sparrows sold for a penny¹⁵?
 Yet neither of them falleth to the ground with-
 30 out the will of your Father. Nay, the very

¹⁵ *Assarion*, value three farthings sterling.

Lu. 21; 16.

Lu. 6; 40.
 Jo. 13; 16.
 & 15; 20.

Mar. 4; 22.
 Lu. 8; 17.
 & 12; 2.

CH. 10.

SECT. V.

31 hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear
 not then, ye are much more valuable than
 32 sparrows. Whosoever, therefore, shall ac-
 knowledge me before men, him will I also
 acknowledge before my Father who is in heav-
 33 en. But whosoever shall disown me before
 men, him will I also disown before my Father
 who is in heaven.

Lu. 12; 8.
 & 9; 26.
 Mar. 8; 38.
 3 Tim. 2; 12.

34 Think not that I am come to bring peace to
 the earth. I came, not to bring peace, but a
 35 sword. For I am come to make dissension
 betwixt father and son, betwixt mother and
 daughter, betwixt mother-in-law and daugh-
 36 ter-in-law, so that a man's enemies will be
 37 found in his own family. He who loveth
 father or mother more than me, is not worthy
 of me. He who loveth son or daughter more
 38 than me, is not worthy of me. He who will
 not take his cross and follow me, is not worthy
 39 of me. He who preserveth his life, shall lose
 it: but he who loseth his life, on my account,
 shall preserve it.

Lu. 12; 51.
 Mic. 7; 5.

Lu. 14; 26.

ch. 16; 24.
 Mar. 8; 34.
 Jo. 12; 25.
 Lu. 9; 23.
 & 17; 33.

40 He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and
 he that receiveth me, receiveth him who sent
 41 me. He that receiveth a prophet, because he
 is a prophet, shall obtain a prophet's reward;
 and he that receiveth a righteous man, be-
 cause he is a righteous man, shall obtain a
 42 righteous man's reward: and whosoever shall
 give any of these little ones, because he is
 my disciple, were it but a cup of cold water, to
 drink; verily I say unto you, he shall not lose
 his reward.

Lu. 10; 10.
 Jo. 13; 20.

Mar. 9; 1.

XI. *WHEN* Jesus had made an end of instructing his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and give warning in the cities.

SECTION VI.

THE CHARACTER OF THE TIMES.

- Lu. 7; 18. 2 *NOW* John having heard in prison of the works of the Messiah, sent two of his disciples, 3 who asked him, Art thou he that cometh, or 4 must we expect another? Jesus answering, said unto them, Go and relate to John what ye 5 have heard and seen. The blind are made to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear; lepers are cleansed; the dead are raised, and good 6 news is brought to the poor: and happy is he, to whom I shall not prove a stumbling block.
- Lu. 7; 24. 7 *When they were departed, Jesus said to the people concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? A reed shaken by 8 the wind? But what went ye to see? A man effeminately dressed? It is king's palaces [not 9 deserts] that such frequent. What then went ye to see? A prophet? Yea, I tell you, and 10 something superior to a prophet: For this is he concerning whom it is written, "Behold I 11 "send mine angel before thee, who shall pre-
pare thy way." Verily I say unto you, among those that are born of women, there*
- Isa. 35; 5.
Isa. 61; 1.
- Mal. 3; 1.
Mar. 1; 2.

SECT. VI.

CH. 11.

- hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist. Yet the least in the reign of heaven shall
 12 be greater than he. From the first appearing of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven is invaded, and invaders take
 13 possession by force. For till John appeared, all the Prophets and the law were your instruc-
 14 ters; and if ye will bear to be told it, this is
 15 the Elijah that was to come. Whoever hath ears to hear, let him hear. Lu. 16; 16. Mal. 4; 5.
- 16 But to what shall I liken this generation? It is like boys in the market-place, to whom their
 17 play-fellows complain, saying, 'We have play-
 'èd to you upon the pipe, but ye have not
 'danced; we have sung mournful songs to
 18 'you, but ye have not lamented.' For John came abstaining from meat and drink, and they
 19 say, 'He hath a demon;' the Son of Man came using meat and drink, and they say, 'He
 'is a lover of banquets and wine, a companion
 'of publicans and sinners.' But wisdom is justified by her children.
- 20 *Then he began to reproach the cities wherein most of his miracles had been performed, be-*
 21 *cause they repented not. Wo unto thee Chora-*
zain, wo unto thee Bethsaida; for if the
miracles which have been performed in you,
had been performed in Tyre and Sidon, they
had repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.
 22 Know, therefore, that the condition of Tyre
 and Sidon, on the day of judgment, shall be
 23 more tolerable than yours. And thou Capernaum, which hast been exalted to heaven,
 shall be brought down to hades; for if the

CH. 12.

SECT. VI.

miracles which have been performed in thee, had been performed in Sodom, it had remained
24 until now . Know, therefore, that the condition of Sodom, on the day of judgment, shall be more tolerable than thine.

Lu. 10 ; 21. 25 *On that occasion Jesus said, I adore thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth ; because, having hidden these things from sages and the learned, thou hast revealed them to babes :*

26 Yes, Father, because such is thy pleasure.

Jo. 3 ; 35.
ch. 6 ; 46.
& 10 ; 15.

27 My Father hath imparted every thing to me ; and none knoweth the Son, except the Father ; neither knoweth any one the Father, except the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal

Jer. 6 ; 16.

28 him. Come unto me all ye who toil and are
29 burdened ; and I will relieve you. Take my yoke upon you, and be taught by me, for I am meek and condescending : and your souls shall

1 Jo. 5 ; 3.

30 find relief. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Mar. 2 ; 23.
Lu. 6 ; 1.

XII. *AT that time, as Jesus was walking through the corn on¹⁶ the Sabbath, his disciples, being hungry, began to pluck the ears of corn, and*

2 eat them. The Pharisees observing this, said to him, Lo ! thy disciples are doing what it is

1 Sam. 21 ; 1.

3 not lawful to do on the Sabbath. *He answered, Have ye not read what David did, and his attendants, when they were hungry ; how he entered the tabernacle of God, and ate the loaves of the presence, which it was not lawful*

¹⁶ With us *Saturday*, or rather from Friday at sun-set, to Saturday at sun-set, for so the Jews reckoned.

SECT. VI.

CH. 12.

for him, or his attendants, to eat, but solely for
 5 the priests? Or have ye not learnt from the Lev. 24; 5.
 Num. 28; 9. law that the priests in the temple violate the
 rest to be observed on Sabbaths, and are nev-
 6 ertheless blameless? Now I affirm that some-
 7 thing greater than the temple is here. But
 had ye known what this meaneth, "I require Hos. 6; 6.
 "humanity and not sacrifice," ye would not
 8 have condemned the guiltless: For the Son of
 Man is master of the Sabbath. ch. 9; 13.

9 *Leaving that place, he went into their syna- Mar. 3; 1.
 Lu. 6; 6.*
 10 *gogue, and found a man there whose hand was
 blasted. They asked Jesus with a design to
 accuse him, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?*

11 *He answered, What man is there amongst you,
 who having one sheep, if it fall into a pit on
 the Sabbath, will not lay hold on it, and lift
 12 it out? And doth not a man greatly excel a
 sheep? It is lawful, therefore, to do good on
 13 the Sabbath. Then he said to the man, Stretch
 out thy hand. And as he stretched it out, it
 14 became sound like the other. But the Phari-
 sees went out and concerted against Jesus to
 destroy him.*

15 *Jesus knowing this, departed, and being fol-
 lowed by a vast multitude, healed all their sick,
 16 enjoining them not to discover him. Thus the
 18 word of the Prophet Isaiah was verified, "Be- Is. 42; 1.
 "hold my servant whom I have chosen, my be-
 "loved in whom my soul delighteth; I will
 "cause my Spirit to abide upon him, and he
 19 "shall give laws to the nations; he will not
 "contend, nor clamour, nor make his voice be*

CH. 12.

SECT. VI.

20 "heard in the streets. *A bruised reed he will not break; and a dimly burning taper he will not quench, till he render his laws victo-*

21 "rious. *Nations also shall trust in his name.*"

22 *Then was brought to him a demoniac dumb and blind; and he cured him, insomuch that he*

23 *both spake and saw. And all the people said*

ch. 9; 34.

Mar. 3; 22.

Lu. 11; 15.

24 *with amazement, Is this the son of David? But the Pharisees hearing them said, This man expelleth demons only by Beelzebub prince of the demons. But Jesus knowing their surmizes, said to them, By civil dissensions any kingdom may be desolated; and no city or family, where such dissensions are, can subsist.*

26 *Now if Satan expel Satan, his kingdom is torn by civil dissensions; how can it then subsist?*

27 *Besides, if I expel demons by Beelzebub; by whom do your sons expel them? Wherefore they shall be your judges. But if I expel demons by the Spirit of God, the reign of God*

Is. 49; 24.

28 *hath overtaken you. For how can one enter the strong one's house, and plunder his goods, unless he first overpower the strong one?*

30 *Then indeed he may plunder his house. He who is not for me, is against me: and he who gathereth not with me, scattereth.*

Mar. 3; 28.

Lu. 12; 10.

1 Jo. 5; 16.

31 *Wherefore I say unto you, though every other sin and detraction in men is pardonable, their detraction from the Spirit is unpardonable: for whosoever shall inveigh against the Son of Man may obtain pardon; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, shall*

32

SECT. VI.

CH. 12.

- never be pardoned, either in the present state,
 33 or in the future. Either call the tree good,
 and its fruit good; or call the tree bad, and its
 fruit bad: for we distinguish the tree by the
 34 fruit. Offspring of vipers, how can ye that
 are evil speak good things, since it is out of the Lu. 6; 45.
 fulness of the heart that the mouth speaketh?
 35 The good man out of his good treasure pro-
 duceth good things: the bad man out of his
 36 bad treasure produceth bad things. Be assur-
 ed, however, that of every pernicious word
 which men shall utter, they shall give an ac-
 37 count on the day of judgment. For by thy 1 Cor. 1; 22.
 words thou shalt be acquitted; and by thy ch. 16; 1.
 words thou shalt be condemned.
- 38 *Then some of the Scribes and Pharisees in-*
terposed, saying, Rabbi, we desire to see a sign
 39 *from thee. He answering, said unto them, An*
 evil and adulterous race demandeth a sign; but
 no sign shall be given them, save the sign of
 40 the Prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three Jon. 1; 17.
 days and three nights in the stomach of the
 great fish, the Son of Man will be three days
 41 and three nights in the bosom of the earth. The Jon. 3; 5.
 Ninevites will stand up in the judgment against
 this race, and cause it to be condemned, be-
 cause they repented when they were warned
 by Jonah; and behold here something greater
 42 than Jonah. The queen of ¹⁶ the south coun- 1 Ki. 10; 1.
 try will arise in the judgment against this race, 2 Chr. 9; 1.
 and cause it to be condemned; because she

¹⁶ In the Old Testament, *Sheba*.

came from the extremities of the earth to hear the wise discourses of Solomon; and behold here something greater than Solomon.

Lu. 11; 24. 43 An unclean spirit, when he is gone out of a man, wandereth over parched deserts in search
44 of a resting-place. And not finding any, he saith, 'I will return to my house whence I
'came;' and being come, he findeth it empty,
45 swept, and furnished. Whereupon he goeth, and bringeth with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and having entered, they dwell there; and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first: thus will it also fare with this evil race.

2 Pet. 2; 20.
Heb. 6; 4.
& 10; 26.

Mar. 3; 31.
Lu. 8; 19. 46 *While he discoursed to the people, his mother and brothers were without, desiring to speak*
47 *with him. And one said to him, Thy mother and thy brothers are without, desiring to speak*
48 *with thee. He answering, said to him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my*
49 *brothers? Then stretching out his hand towards his disciples, he said, Behold my mother*
50 *and my brothers. For whosoever doth the will of my Father who is in heaven, is my brother, and sister, and mother.*

SECTION VII.

PARABLES.

XIII. *THE* same day, *Jesus* having gone out of the Mar. 4; 1.
 2 house, sat by the sea side; but so great a mul-
 titude flocked about him, that he went into a
 bark, and sat down there, while all the people
 3 stood on the shore. Then he discoursed to them
 of many things in parables.

4 THE sower, said he, went out to sow; and in Mar. 4; 3.
 sowing, some seeds fell by the way-side, and Lu. 8; 4.
 5 the birds came and picked them up: some fell
 on rocky ground where they had little earth:
 these sprang up the sooner, because the soil
 6 had no depth: but after the sun had beaten
 upon them, they were scorched, and having no
 7 root, withered away. Some fell among thorns,
 and the thorns grew up and choked them.
 8 Others fell into good ground, and yielded in-
 crease, some a hundred, some sixty, some
 9 thirty fold. Whoever hath ears to hear, let
 him hear.

10 Then the disciples accosted him, saying, Mar. 4; 10.
 11 Why speakest thou to them in parables? *He* Lu. 8; 9.
answering, said unto them, Because it is your
 privilege, and not theirs, to know the secrets
 12 of the reign of heaven. For to him that hath, ch. 25; 29.
 more shall be given, and he shall abound;

CH. 13.

SECT. VII.

Mar. 4; 25.
Lu. 8; 18.

but from him that hath not, even that which he
13 hath shall be taken. For this reason I speak

Isa. 6; 9.
Mar. 4; 12.
Lu. 8; 10.
Jo. 12; 39.
Acts, 28; 25.
Ro. 11; 8.

to them in parables; because they seeing,
14 see not; and hearing, hear not, nor regard; in-
somuch that this prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled
in them, "Ye may indeed listen, but will not
" understand; ye may look, but will not per-

15 " ceive. For this people's understanding is
" stupified, their ears are deafened, and their
" eyes they have closed; lest seeing with their
" eyes, hearing with their ears, and apprehend-
" ing with their understanding; they should

Lu. 10; 23.

16 " repent, and I should reclaim them." But
blessed are your eyes, because they see, and

17 your ears, because they hear. For verily I say
unto you, that many prophets and righteous
men have desired to see the things which ye
see, but have not seen them; and to hear the
things which ye hear, but have not heard them.

Mar. 4; 14.
Lu. 8; 11.

18 Understand ye, therefore, the parable of the

19 sower. When one heareth the doctrine of the
reign, but mindeth it not, the evil one cometh,
and snatcheth away that which was sown in
his heart. This explaineth what fell by the

20 way-side. That which fell on rocky ground,
denoteth him who, hearing the word, receiveth

21 it at first with pleasure; yet not having it
rooted in his mind, retaineth it but a while;

for when trouble or persecution cometh, be-
cause of the word, instantly he relapseth.

22 That which fell among thorns, denoteth that
hearer in whom worldly cares, and deceitful
riches, stifle the word, and render it unfruitful.

SECT. VII.

CH. 13.

23 But that which fell into good soil, and bore fruit, some a hundred, some sixty, some thirty fold, denoteth him who not only heareth and mindeth, but obeyeth the word.

24 *Another parable he proposed to them, saying,*
The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a field in which the proprietor had sown good
25 grain: but while people were asleep, his enemy came, and sowed darnel among the wheat,
26 and went off. When the blade was up, and putting forth the ear, then appeared also the
27 darnel. And the servants came and said to their master, ‘Sir, thou sowedst good grain in
28 ‘thy field; whence, then, hath it darnel?’ He answered, ‘An enemy hath done this.’ They said, ‘Wilt thou, then, that we weed them out?’
29 He replied, ‘No; lest in weeding out the dar-
30 ‘nel, ye tear up also the wheat. Let both
‘grow together until the harvest; and in the
‘time of harvest, I will say to the reapers,
‘First gather the darnel, and make them into
‘bundles for burning; then carry the wheat
‘into my barn.’

31 *Another similitude he proposed to them, say-* Mar. 4; 31·
Lu. 13; 19·
ing, The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of
32 mustard-seed, which a man set in his field; for though it is the smallest of all seeds, it is, when grown, larger than any herb, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air take shelter in its branches.

33 *Another similitude he gave them:* Lu. 13; 21· The kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman mingled in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened.

CH. 13.

SECT. VII.

- 34 *All these similitudes Jesus spoke to the people ; for he taught them only by similitudes ;*
- Ps. 78 ; 2. 35 *herein verifying the words of the Prophet : “ I will discourse in parables ; I will utter things whereof all antiquity hath been silent.”*
- 36 *Then Jesus, leaving the multitude, retired to the house, where his disciples accosted him, saying, Explain to us the parable of the darnel in*
- 37 *the field. Jesus answering, said unto them, He who sowed the good seed is the Son of*
- 38 *Man. The field is the world : the good seed are the sons of the kingdom ; and the darnel*
- 39 *are the sons of the evil one. The enemy who sowed them is the devil : the harvest is the conclusion of this state ; and the reapers are*
- 40 *the angels. As, therefore, the darnel is gathered and burnt, so shall it be at the conclusion*
- 41 *of this state. The Son of Man will send his angels, who shall gather out of his kingdom all*
- 42 *seducers and iniquitous persons, and throw them into the burning furnace : weeping and*
- Dan. 12 ; 3. 43 *gnashing of teeth shall be there. Then shall the righteous shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Whoever hath ears to hear, let him hear.*
- 44 *Again, the kingdom of heaven is like treasure hid in a field, which, when a man hath discovered, he concealeth the discovery, and for joy thereof, selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.*
- 45 *Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a pearl extremely precious, which a merchant, who*
- 46 *was in quest of fine pearls, having met with, sold all that he had and purchased it.*

SECT. VIII.

CH. 13.

47 Again the kingdom of heaven is like a
sweep-net cast into the sea, which incloseth
48 fishes of every kind. When it is full, they
draw it ashore, and gather the good into ves-
49 sels, but throw the useless away. So shall it
be at the conclusion of this state. The angels
will come and sever the wicked from among
50 the righteous, and throw them into the burn-
ing furnace. Weeping and gnashing of teeth
shall be there.

51 *Jesus said, Do ye understand all these*
52 *things? They answered, Yes, Master. He*
added, Every scribe, therefore, instructed for
the reign of heaven, is like a householder who
bringeth out of his storehouse new things and
53 *old. And after he had finished these simili-*
tudes, he departed thence.

SECTION VIII.

THE PEOPLE TWICE FED IN THE DESERT.

54 *JESUS being come into his own country, taught* Mar. 6 ; 1.
the inhabitants in their synagogue : and they Lu. 4 ; 16.
said with astonishment, Whence hath this man Jo. 6 ; 42.
this wisdom and this power of working mira-
55 *cles? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not*
his mother called Mary? And do not his
brothers, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Ju-
56 *das, and all his sisters, live amongst us?*
Whence then hath HE all these things? Thus
57 *they were scandalized at him. But Jesus said*

Jo. 4; 44.

to them, A prophet is no where disregarded, except in his own country, and in his own family. *And he did not many miracles there because of their unbelief.*

Mar. 6; 14.
Lu. 9; 7.

XIV. *AT that time Herod the tetrarch¹⁷ hearing 2 of the fame of Jesus, said to his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is raised from the dead; and therefore miracles are performed by him.*

Mar. 6; 17.

3 *For Herod had caused John to be apprehended, imprisoned, and bound, on account of Herodias his brother Philip's wife; for John had*

Lu. 3; 19.

4 *said to him, It is not lawful for thee to have*

Lev. 18; 16.
& 20; 21.

5 *her. And Herod would have put him to death, but was afraid of the populace, who accounted*

ch. 21; 26.

6 *him a prophet. But when Herod's birth-day was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before the company, and pleased Herod so highly, that he swore he would grant her whatever she should ask. She being instigated by her mother, said, Give me here in a basin the head of John the Baptist. And the king was sorry; nevertheless, from a regard to his oath and his guests, he commanded that it should be given her. Accordingly John was beheaded in the prison by his order. And his head was brought in a basin and presented to the damsel; and she carried it to her mother. After which his disciples went and fetched the body, and having buried it, came and told Jesus.*

¹⁷ That is, governour of a fourth part.

SECT. VIII.

CH. 14.

- 13 *When Jesus heard this, he embarked privately, and retired into a desert place ; whereof the people being informed, followed him by land out* Mar. 6 ; 32.
Lu. 9 ; 10.
- 14 *of the cities. Observing, as he landed, a great multitude, he had compassion upon them, and healed their sick.*
- 15 *Towards the evening his disciples accosted him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past ; dismiss the multitude, that they may go to the villages, and buy them-* Mar. 6 ; 35.
Lu. 9 ; 12.
- 16 *selves victuals. Jesus answered, They need* Jo. 6 ; 5.
- 17 *not go. Supply them yourselves. They said to him, We have here but five loaves and two*
- 18 *fishes. He replied, Bring them hither to me.*
- 19 *Then having commanded the people to lie down upon the grass, he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking towards heaven, blessed them ; then breaking the loaves, he gave them to the disciples, and they distributed them*
- 20 *among the people. When all had partaken, and were satisfied, they carried off twelve baskets*
- 21 *full of the fragments that remained. Now they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children.*
- 22 *Immediately Jesus obliged his disciples to embark and pass over before him, while he dis-* Mar. 6 ; 45.
Jo. 6 ; 16.
- 23 *missed the multitude. Having dismissed the multitude, he retired by himself to a mountain to pray, and remained there alone till it was*
- 24 *late. By that time the bark was half way over, tossed by the waves, for the wind was contrary.*

CH. 15.

SECT. VIII.

25 *In the fourth watch of the night* ¹⁸, *Jesus went to*
 26 *them, walking upon the sea. When the disci-*
ples saw him walking upon the sea, being terri-
fied, they exclaimed, An apparition! and cried
 27 *out for fear. Jesus immediately spoke to them;*
saying, Take courage, it is I, be not afraid.
 28 *Peter answering, said to him, If it be thou,*
Master, bid me come to thee upon the water.
 29 *Jesus said, Come. Then Peter getting out of*
the bark, walked upon the water towards Jesus.
 30 *But finding the wind boisterous, he was frighten-*
ed; and beginning to sink, cried, Master, save me.
 31 *Jesus instantly stretching out his hand, caught*
him, and said to him, Distrustful man, where-
 32 *fore didst thou doubt? When they had gone*
 33 *aboard, the wind ceased. Then those in the*
bark came, and prostrated themselves before
him, saying, Thou art assuredly a Son of God.
 34 *Having passed over, they landed on the terri-*
 35 *tory of Gennesaret* ¹⁹; *the inhabitants whereof*
 36 *brought to him all the diseased, who besought*
him to let them touch but a tuft of his mantle;
and as many as touched, were cured.

Mar. 6; 53.

Mar. 7; 1.

XV. *Then some Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusa-*
 2 *lem addressed him, saying, Why do thy disci-*
ples transgress the tradition of the elders? For
 3 *they wash not their hands before meals. Jesus*
answering, said unto them, Why do ye your-

¹⁸ Between three and six in the morning.

¹⁹ In the Old Testament, *Chinnereth*.

selves, by your tradition, transgress the com-
 4 mandment of God? For God hath commanded,
 saying, "Honour thy father and mother;" and, Ex. 20; 12.
 "Whosoever revileth father or mother shall be Deu. 5; 16.
 5 "punished with death." But ye affirm, If a Ex. 21; 17.
 man say to father or mother, 'I devote what- Lev. 20; 9.
 6 'ever of mine shall profit thee,' he shall not Pro. 20; 20.
 afterwards honour, by his assistance, his father
 or his mother. Thus, by your tradition, ye
 7 annul the commandment of God. Hypocrites,
 well do ye suit the character which Isaiah gave
 8 of you, saying, "This people address me with Isa. 29; 13.
 "their mouth, and honour me with their lips,
 9 "though their heart is estranged from me. 'But
 "in vain they worship me, while they teach
 "institutions merely human."
 10 *Then having called the multitude, he said to* Mar. 7; 14.
 11 *them, Hear, and be instructed. It is not what*
 goeth into the mouth which polluteth the man;
 but it is what proceedeth out of the mouth
 12 which polluteth the man. *Thereupon his dis-*
iples accosting him, said, Didst thou observe
 how the Pharisees, when they heard that say-
 13 ing, were scandalized? *He answered, Every*
 plant which my heavenly Father hath not
 14 planted, shall be extirpated. Let them alone.
 They are blind leaders of the blind; and if the Lu. 6; 39.
 blind lead the blind, both will fall into the Mar. 7; 17.
 15 ditch. *Then Peter addressing him, said, Ex-*
 16 *plain to us that saying. Jesus answered, Are*
 17 *ye also still void of understanding? Do ye not*
 18 *yet apprehend, that whatever entereth the*
 mouth, passeth into the belly, and is thrown

CH. 15.

SECT. VIII.

out into the sink? But that which proceedeth
 out of the mouth, issueth from the heart, and
 19 so polluteth the man. For out of the heart
 proceed malicious contrivances, murders, adul-
 teries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies,
 20 calumnies. These are the things which pol-
 lute the man; but to eat with unwashen hands
 polluteth not the man.

Mar. 7; 24.

21 *THEN* Jesus withdrew into the confines of
 22 Tyre and Sidon; and behold! a Canaanitish
 woman of these territories came to him, crying,
 Master, Son of David, have pity upon me; my
 daughter is grievously afflicted by a demon.
 23 But he gave her no answer. Then his disciples
 interposed, and intreated him, saying, Dismiss
 24 her, for she clamoureth after us. *He answer-*
ing, said, My mission is only to the lost sheep
 25 of the stock of Israel. *She, nevertheless, ad-*
vanced, and prostrating herself before him, said,
 26 O Master, help me! *He replied,* It is not seem-
 ly to take the children's bread, and throw it to
 27 the dogs. True, Sir, *returned she,* yet even the
 dogs are allowed the crumbs which fall from
 28 their master's table. *Then Jesus, answering,*
said to her, O woman! great is thy faith. Be
 it unto thee as thou desirest. *And that instant*
her daughter was healed.

ch. 10; 6.

29 *Jesus having left that place, came nigh the sea*
of Galilee, and repaired to a mountain, where he
 30 *sat down: and great multitudes flocked to him,*
bringing with them the lame, the blind, the dumb,
the cripple, and several others [in distress,]

SECT. VIII.

CH. 16.

whom they laid at his feet; and he healed
 31 them: insomuch, that the people beheld, with Isa. 35; 5.
 admiration, the dumb speaking, the cripple
 sound, the lame walking, and the blind seeing;
 and they glorified the God of Israel.

32 Then Jesus called to him his disciples, and Mar. 8; 1.
 said, I have compassion on the multitude, be-
 cause they have now attended me three days,
 and have nothing to eat: I will not dismiss
 them fasting, lest their strength fail by the
 33 way. His disciples answered, Whence can we
 get bread enough in this solitude to satisfy
 34 such a crowd? He asked them, How many
 loaves have ye? They said, Seven, and a few
 35 small fishes. Then commanding the people to
 36 lie down upon the ground, he took the seven
 loaves and the fishes, which, having given
 thanks, he divided and gave to his disciples, who
 37 distributed them among the people. When all
 had partaken, and were satisfied, they carried
 off seven maunds full of the fragments that re-
 38 mained. Now they that had eaten were four
 thousand men, beside women and children.

39 Then having dismissed the multitude, he em-
 barked, and sailed to the coast of Magdala.

XVI. Thither some Pharisees and Sadducees re- Mar. 8; 11.
 paired, who, to try him, desired that he would Lu. 12; 54.
 2 show them a sign in the sky. He answering,
 said to them, In the evening ye say, 'It will
 3 'be fair weather, for the sky is red;' and in
 the morning, 'There will be a storm to-day,
 'for the sky is red and lowering.' Ye can
 judge aright of the appearance of the sky, but

- ch. 12 ; 39. 4 cannot discern the signs of the times. An evil and adulterous race demandeth a sign, but no sign shall be given them, save the sign of the Prophet Jonah. *Then leaving them, he departed.*
- Mar. 8 ; 14. 5 *Now his disciples, before they came over, had*
Lu. 12 ; 1. 6 *forgotten to bring loaves with them. Jesus said to them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.*
- 7 *Whereupon they said, reasoning among themselves, This is because we have brought no*
8 *loaves with us. Jesus perceiving it, said to them, What do ye reason amongst yourselves, O ye distrustful ? That I speak thus, because*
ch. 14 ; 15. 9 *ye have brought no loaves ? Have ye no reflection ? Or do ye not remember the five loaves among the five thousand, and how many*
ch. 15 ; 32. 10 *baskets ye filled with the fragments ; nor the seven loaves among the four thousand, and how*
11 *many maunds ye filled ? How is it that ye do not understand that I spake not concerning bread, when I bade you beware of the leaven*
12 *of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees ? Then they understood that he cautioned them not against the leaven which the Pharisees and the Sadducees used in bread, but against their doctrines.*

SECTION IX.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

- 13 *AS Jesus was going to the district of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Who* Mar. 8 ; 27.
Lu. 9 ; 18.
- 14 *do men say that the Son of Man is? They answered, Some say, 'John the Baptist,' others, 'Elijah,' others, 'Jeremiah, or one of the*
- 15 *'Prophets.' But who, returned he, say ye that*
- 16 *I am? Simon Peter answering, said, Thou art* Jo. 6 ; 69.
- 17 *the Messiah, the Son of the living God. Jesus replying, said to him, Happy art thou Simon Barjona²⁰; for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but my Father who is in*
- 18 *heaven. I tell thee likewise, Thou art named* Jo. 1 ; 42.
- 19 *Rock²¹; and on this rock I will build my church, over which the gates of hades shall not*
- 20 *prevail. Moreover I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatever thou shalt* ch. 18 ; 18.
Jo. 20 ; 23.
- 21 *bind upon the earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose upon the earth, shall be loosed in heaven. Then he forbade his disciples to tell any man that he is the Messiah.*
- 21 *From that time Jesus began to discover to his disciples, that he must go to Jerusalem, and there suffer much from the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and that* ch. 17 ; 22.
ch. 20 ; 17.
Mar. 8 ; 31.
& 9 ; 31.
Lu. 9 ; 44.

²⁰ Syr. son of Jonas.

²¹ So Peter in Greek, and Cephas in Syr. signify.

CH. 17.

SECT. IX.

22 *he must be raised the third day. On which Peter taking him aside, reprov'd him, saying, God forbid, Master, this shall not befall thee.*

23 *But he turning said to Peter, Get thee hence, adversary, thou art an obstacle in my way, for thou relishest not the things of God, but the things of men.*

ch. 10 ; 38.
Mar. 8 ; 34.

24 *Then said Jesus to his disciples, If any man will come under my guidance, let him renounce himself, and take up his cross and follow me.*

Lu. 9 ; 23.
14 ; 27. &
17 ; 33.
Jo. 12 ; 25.

25 *For whosoever would save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my*

26 *sake, shall find it. What is a man profited, if he should gain the whole world, with the forfeit of his life? or what will a man not give in*

27 *ransom for his life? For the Son of Man, vested with his Father's glory, shall come hereafter with his angels, and recompense every*

Ro. 2 ; 6.
Rev. 22 ; 12.
Mar. 9 ; 1.
Lu. 9 ; 27.

28 *one according to his actions. Verily I say unto you, Some of those who are present, shall not taste death, until they see the Son of Man enter upon his reign.*

Mar. 9 ; 2.
Lu. 9 ; 28.

XVII. *AFTER six days Jesus took Peter, and James, and John brother of James, apart to the*

2 *top of a high mountain, and was transfigured in their presence. His face shown as the sun; and his raiment became white as the light.*

3 *And presently appeared to them Moses and*

2 Pet. 1 ; 17.
ch. 3 ; 17.
Mar. 1 ; 11.
Lu. 9 ; 22.

4 *Elijah conversing with him. Peter upon this addressing Jesus, said, Master, it is good for us to stay here; let us make here, if thou wilt, three booths, one for thee, and one for Moses,*

SECT. IX.

CH. 17.

- 5 and one for Elijah. *While he was speaking, behold! a bright cloud covered them, and out of the cloud came a voice which said, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I delight, hear him.*
- 6 *The disciples hearing this, fell upon their faces,*
- 7 *and were greatly frightened. But Jesus came and touched them, saying, Arise; be not afraid*
- 8 *Then lifting up their eyes, they saw none but Jesus.*
- 9 *As they went down from the mountain, Jesus* Mar. 9; 9
- 10 *commanded them, saying, Tell nobody what ye have seen, until the Son of Man be risen from*
- 11 *the dead. Then the disciples asked him, saying, Why say the Scribes that Elijah must*
- 12 *come first? Jesus answering, said to them, To consummate the whole, Elijah indeed must*
- 13 *come first. But I tell you, Elijah is come already, though they did not acknowledge him, but have treated them as they pleased. Thus* ch. 11; 14.
- 14 *they will treat the Son of Man also. Then the disciples understood that he spake concerning John the Baptist.*
- 15 *When they were come to the multitude, a* Mar. 9; 14
- 16 *man came to him, who kneeling, said, Sir, have* Lu. 9; 37
- 17 *pity on my son; for he is grievously distressed with lunacy; often he falleth into the fire,*
- 18 *and often into the water, and I presented him to thy disciples; but they could not cure him.*
- 19 *Jesus answering, said, O unbelieving and perverse race! How long shall I be with you? How long shall I suffer you? Bring him hither*
- 20 *to me. Then Jesus rebuked the demon, and he came out: and the lad was instantly cured.*

- Mar. 9 ; 28. 19 *Hereupon the disciples came to him privately, saying, Why could we not expel this demon?*
- Lu. 17 ; 6. 20 *Jesus answered, Because of your unbelief; for verily I say unto you, if ye had faith, though but as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say to this mountain, Remove to yonder place, and it would remove: yea nothing would be impossi-*
21 *ble to you. This kind however, is not dis-*
22 *possessed, unless by prayer and fasting.*
- ch. 16 ; 21. 22 *While they remained in Galilee, Jesus said to*
& 20 ; 18. *them, The Son of Man is to be delivered up*
Mar. 9 ; 31. 23 *to men who will kill him: but the third day he*
Lu. 9 ; 44. *shall be raised again. And they were grieved*
exceedingly.
- 24 *When they were come to Capernaum, the col-*
lectors came and asked Peter, Doth not your
25 *teacher pay the didrachma²²? He said, Yes.*
Being come into the house, before he spoke,
Jesus said to him, What is thy opinion, Simon?
From whom do the kings of the earth exact
tribute or custom? From their own sons, or
26 *from others? Peter answered, From others.*
Jesus replied, The sons then are exempted.
27 *Nevertheless, lest we should give them of-*
fence, go to the sea and throw a line, draw out
the first fish that is hooked, and, having opened
its mouth, thou shalt find a stater²³, take that
and give it them for me and thee.
- Mar. 9 ; 33. XVIII. *At that time the disciples came to Jesus*
Lu. 9 ; 46. *inquiring, Who shall be the greatest in the*
2 *reign of heaven? Jesus calling to him a child,*

²² About 1s. 3d. sterling.²³ Value, half a crown.

- 3 placed him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, unless ye be changed, and become as children, ye shall never enter the
 4 kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall become humble like this child, shall be
 5 the greatest in the reign of heaven. Nay, whosoever receiveth one such child, in my name,
 6 receiveth me; but whosoever shall insnare any of these little ones who believe in me, it were better for him that an upper millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were sunk in the ocean.
- 7 Woe unto the world because of snares; snares indeed there must be; nevertheless woe
 8 to the insnarer. Wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot insnare thee, cut it off and throw it away; it is better for thee to enter lame or maimed into life, than having two hands or two
 9 feet to be cast into the everlasting fire. And if thine eye insnare thee, pluck it out and throw it away; it is better for thee to enter one-eyed into life, than having two eyes to be
 10 cast into hell-fire. Beware of contemning any of these little ones; for I assure you that in heaven their angels continually behold the
 11 face of my heavenly Father: and the Son of
 12 Man is come to recover the lost. What think ye? If a man have a hundred sheep, and one of them have strayed, will he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains, and go in
 13 quest of the stray? And if he happen to find it, verily I say unto you, he deriveth greater joy from it than from the ninety-nine which went

ch. 19; 14.

Mar. 9; 42.
Lu. 17; 1.Mar. 5; 29.
Mar. 9; 43.Lu. 19; 10.
Lu. 15; 4.

- 14 not astray. Thus it is not the will of your Father in heaven that any of these little ones should be lost.
- 15 Wherefore, if thy brother trespass against thee, go and expostulate with him, when thou and he are alone together. If he hear thee, 16 thou hast gained thy brother: but if he will not hear, take one or two along with thee, that by the testimony of two or three witnesses 17 every thing may be ascertained. If he despise them, acquaint the congregation with it; and if he despise the congregation also, let him be 18 to thee as a pagan or a publican. Verily I say unto you; whatsoever ye shall bind upon the earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose upon the earth, shall be loosed in heaven.
- 19 Again, I say unto you, whatever two of you upon the earth, shall agree to ask, shall be granted them by my Father who is in heaven.
- 20 For wheresoever two or three are assembled in my name, I am in the midst of them.
- 21 *Then Peter approaching, said unto him, Master, if my brother repeatedly trespass against me; how often must I forgive him? Must I* 22 *seven times? Jesus answered, I say unto thee, Not seven times, but seventy times seven times.*
- 23 In this the administration of heaven resembleth that of a king, who determined to settle 24 accounts with his servants. Having begun to reckon, one was brought who owed him ten 25 thousand talents²⁴. But that servant not hav-

Lev. 19; 17.
Ecclus. 19;
13.
Lu. 17; 3.

Deu. 19; 15.
Jo. 8; 17.
2 Co. 13; 1.

ch. 16; 19.
Jo. 20; 23.

Lu. 17; 3.

²⁴ Above three millions sterling.

SECT. IX.

CH. 18.

ing wherewith to pay; his master, to obtain payment, commanded that he and his wife and children, and all that he had, should be sold.

26 Then the servant throwing himself prostrate before his master, cried, ‘Have patience with
 27 ‘me, my lord, and I will pay the whole.’ And his master had compassion upon him, and dismissed him, remitting the debt. But this servant, as he went out, meeting one of his fellow-servants, who owed him a hundred denarii²⁵, seized him by the throat, saying, ‘Pay me what
 20 ‘thou owest.’ His fellow-servant threw himself at his feet, and besought him, saying, ‘Have patience with me, and I will pay thee.’
 30 And he would not, but instantly caused him to be imprisoned, until he should discharge the
 31 debt. His fellow-servants seeing this, were deeply affected, and went, and informed their
 32 master of all that had passed. Then his master, having given orders to call him, said to him, ‘Thou wicked servant: all that debt I
 ‘forgave thee, because thou besoughtest me.
 33 ‘Oughtest not thou to have shewn such pity to
 34 ‘thy fellow-servant, as I shewed to thee?’ So his master, being provoked, delivered him to the jailors, to remain in their hands, until he
 35 should clear the debt. Thus will my celestial Father treat every one of you who forgiveth not from his heart the faults of his brother.

²⁵ About three guineas.

SECTION X.

THE RICH MAN'S APPLICATION.

- Mar. 10 ; 1. XIX. *WHEN* Jesus had ended this discourse, he
left Galilee, and came into the confines of Ju-
2. dea upon the Jordan, whither great multitudes
followed him, and he healed their sick.
- Mar. 10 ; 2. 3 Then some Pharisees came to him, and trying
him, asked, Can a man lawfully, upon every
4 pretence, divorce his wife ? *He answered*, Have
ye not read, that at the beginning, when the
Gen. 1 ; 27. Creator made man, he formed a male and a
5 female, and said, " For this cause a man shall
Gen. 2 ; 24.
1 Co. 6 ; 16.
Eph. 5 ; 31. " leave father and mother, and adhere to his
" wife, and they two shall be one flesh."
6 Wherefore they are no longer two, but one
flesh. What then God hath conjoined, let not
7 man separate. *They replied*, Why then did
Moses command to give a writing of divorce-
8 ment, and dismiss her ? *He answered*, Moses
indeed, because of your untractable disposition,
permitted you to divorce your wives, but it
9 was not so from the beginning. Therefore I
say unto you, Whoever divorceth his wife, ex-
cept for whoredom, and marrieth another, com-
mitteth adultery : and whoever marrieth the
10 woman divorced, committeth adultery. *His*
- Deut. 24 ; 1.
ch. 5 ; 31.
- Lu. 16 ; 18.
- 1 Co. 7 ; 11.

SECT. X.

CH. 19.

disciples said to him, If such be the condition of the husband, it is better to live unmarried.

11 *He answered, They alone are capable of living*
 12 *thus, on whom the power is conferred. For*
some are eunuchs from their birth; others
have been made eunuchs by men; and others,
for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, have
made themselves eunuchs. Let him act this
part who can act it.

13 *Then children were presented to him, that he* Mar. 10; 13.
might lay his hands upon them, and pray [for Lu. 18; 15.
them;] but the disciples reprov'd [those who
 14 *brought] them. Jesus said, Let the children* ch. 18; 1.
alone, and hinder them not from coming unto
me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven.
 15 *And having laid his hands on them, he departed*
thence.

16 *Afterwards, one approaching, said to him,* Mar. 10; 17.
Good Teacher, what good must I do to obtain Lu. 18; 18.
 17 *eternal life? He answered, Why callest thou*
me good? God alone is good. If thou wouldst
enter into that life, keep the commandments.
 18 *He said unto him, Which? Jesus answered,*
 “Thou shalt not commit murder. Thou shalt
 “not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal.
 19 “Thou shalt not give false testimony. Honour
 “thy father and mother; and love thy neigh-
 20 “bour as thyself.” *The young man replied, All*
these I have observed from my childhood.
 21 *Wherein am I still deficient? Jesus answered,*
If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell thy estate,
and give the price to the poor, and thou shalt
have treasure in heaven; then come and fol-

CH. 20.

SECT. X.

22 low me. *The young man hearing this, went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions.*

Mar. 10 ; 23.
Lu. 18 ; 24.

23 *Whereupon Jesus said to his disciples, Verily I say unto you, it is difficult for a rich man*
24 *to enter the kingdom of heaven : I say further, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the*
25 *kingdom of God. His disciples, who heard this with amazement, said, Who then can be saved ?*
26 *Jesus, looking at them, answered, With men this is impossible, but with God every thing is possible.*

Mar. 10 ; 28.
Lu. 18 ; 28.

27 *Then Peter replying, said, As for us, we have forsaken all, and followed thee ; what*
28 *then shall be our reward ? Jesus answered, Verily I say unto you, that at the renovation, when the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve*
29 *tribes of Israel. And whosoever shall have forsaken, on my account, houses, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, shall receive a hundred-fold, and inherit eternal life.*

Lu. 22 ; 30.

Mar. 10 ; 31.
Lu. 13 ; 30.

30 *But many shall be first that are last, and last*
XX. *that are first. For the administration of heaven will resemble the conduct of a householder, who went out early in the morning to*
2 *hire labourers for his vineyard. Having agreed with some for a denarius²⁶ a day, he sent them*
3 *into his vineyard. About the third hour²⁷ he*

²⁶ About sevenpence halfpenny.

²⁷ Nine o'clock morning.

SECT. X.

CH. 20.

went out, and seeing others unemployed in the
 4 market-place, said to them, Go ye likewise
 into my vineyard, and I will give you what is
 5 reasonable. Accordingly they went. Again,
 about the sixth hour²⁸, and about the ninth²⁹,
 6 he went out and did the same. Lastly, about
 the eleventh hour³⁰, he went out, and finding
 others unemployed, said to them, ‘ Why stand
 7 ‘ ye all the day here doing nothing?’ They
 answered, ‘ Because nobody hath hired us.’
 He said to them, ‘ Go ye also into my vine-
 ‘ yard, and ye shall receive what is reasonable.’
 8 When it was night, the proprietor of the vine-
 yard said to his steward, ‘ Call the labourers,
 ‘ and pay them their wages, beginning with the
 9 ‘ last, and ending with the first.’ Then they
 who had been hired at the eleventh hour came,
 10 and received each a denarius. When the first
 came, they imagined they should get more ;
 11 but they got only a denarius a-piece. Upon
 receiving it, they murmured against the house-
 12 holder, saying, ‘ These last have worked but
 ‘ one hour ; yet thou hast made them equal to
 ‘ us who have borne the burden and the heat
 13 ‘ of the day.’ He answering said to one of
 them, ‘ Friend, I do thee no injury. Didst not
 14 ‘ thou agree with me for a denarius? Take
 ‘ what is thine, and depart. It is my will to
 15 ‘ give to this last as much as to thee. And
 ‘ may not I do what I will with mine own?

²⁸ Noon.²⁹ Three o'clock afternoon.³⁰ Five o'clock afternoon.

ch. 22; 14. 16 'Is thine eye evil, because I am good?' Thus the last shall be first, and the first last; for there are many called, but few chosen.

SECTION XI.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

Mar. 10; 32. 17 *WHEN* Jesus was on the road to Jerusalem,
 Lu. 18; 31. he took the twelve disciples aside, and said to
 ch. 16; 21. 18 them, We are now going to Jerusalem, where
 & 17; 22. the Son of Man shall be delivered to the chief
 19 priests and the scribes, who will condemn him
 to die, and consign him to the Gentiles, to be
 mocked, and scourged, and crucified: but the
 third day he shall rise again.

Mar. 10; 35. 20 *Then the mother of Zebedee's children came*
to him with her sons, and, prostrating herself,
intreated he would grant the request she had to
 21 *make. He said to her, What wouldst thou?*
She answered, That, in thy reign, one of these
 22 *my two sons may sit at thy right hand, the*
 other at thy left. *Jesus replying, said, Ye*
 know not what ye ask. Can ye drink such a
 cup as I must drink; or undergo an immer-
 sion like that which I must undergo? *They*
 23 *said unto him, We can. He answered, Ye*
 shall indeed drink such a cup, and undergo an
 immersion like that which I must undergo.
 But to sit at my right hand and at my left I

SECT. XI.

CH. 21.

cannot give, unless to those for whom it is prepared by my Father.

24 *The ten hearing this were full of indignation* Mar. 10; 41.
 25 *against the two brothers; but Jesus calling* Lu. 22; 12.
them to him, said, Ye know that the princes of
 the nations domineer over them, and the great
 26 exercise their authority upon them. It must
 not be so amongst you: on the contrary, who-
 soever would become great amongst you, let
 27 him be your servant; and whosoever would be
 28 chief amongst you, let him be your slave: even Phil. 2; 7.
 as the Son of Man came not to be served, but
 to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.

29 *As they left Jericho, followed by a great* Mar. 10; 46.
 30 *multitude, two blind men, who sat by the way-* Lu. 18; 35.
side, hearing that Jesus passed by, cried, say-
ing, Master, Son of David, have pity upon us.
 31 *The multitude charged them to be silent: but*
they cried the louder, saying, Master, Son of
 32 *David, have pity upon us. Then Jesus stop-*
ping called them, and said, What do ye want
 33 *me to do for you? They answered, Sir, to*
 34 *make us see. Jesus had compassion, and*
touched their eyes. Immediately they received
sight, and followed him.

XXI. *When they were nigh Jerusalem, being come* Mar. 11; 1.
to Bethphage, near the Mount of Olives, Jesus Lu. 19; 29.
 2 *sent two of his disciples, saying, Go to the*
 village opposite to you, where ye will find an
 ass tied, and her colt with her; loose them and
 3 bring them hither. If any man say aught unto
 you, say, 'The Master wanteth them,' and he

CH. 21.

SECT. XI.

4 will send them directly. *Now all this was done that the words of the Prophet might be fulfilled, "Say to the daughter of Zion, Be- hold thy King cometh to thee lowly, riding on "an ass, even the colt of a labouring beast."*

6 *Accordingly the disciples went, and having done as Jesus had commanded them, brought the ass and the colt, and covering them with their mantles, made him ride. Now the greater part spread their mantles in the way; others lopped branches off the trees, and strowed them in the way, while the crowd that went before and that followed, shouted, saying, Hosanna³¹ to the*

10 *Son of David; blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord³². Hosanna in the highest heaven. When he entered Jerusalem, the whole city was in an uproar, every body asking, Who is this? The crowd answered, It is Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth in Galilee.*

12 *Then Jesus went into the temple of God, and drove thence all who sold and who bought in the temple, and overturned the tables of the money-changers, and the stalls of those who sold doves,*

13 *and said to them, It is written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer, and ye have made it a den of robbers." Then the blind and the lame came to him in the temple, and he healed them. But the chief priests and the scribes, seeing the wonders which he performed, and the boys crying in the temple, Hosanna to*

³¹ Save now I pray.

³² In Heb. Jehovah.

Isa. 62; 11.
Zech. 9; 9.
Jo. 12; 15.

Ps. 118; 25.

Jo. 2; 14.
Mar. 11; 15.
Lu. 19; 45.

Is. 56; 7.
Jer. 7; 11.

Lu. 19; 38.
39. & 46.

SECT. XI.

CH. 21.

- the Son of David, said to him with indignation,*
- 16 *Hearst thou what these say ? Jesus answered,*
 Yes. Have ye never read, “ From the mouth Ps. 8 ; 2.
 “ of infants and sucklings thou has procured
- 17 “ praise.” *Thereupon leaving them he went out*
of the city to Bethany, where he remained that
night.
- 18 *Returning to the city in the morning he was* Mar. 11 ; 12-
 19 *hungry, and seeing a single fig-tree by the road,* & 20.
he went to it ; but finding only leaves on it,
said, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward.
- 20 *And the fig-tree withered forthwith. When the*
disciples saw it, they said with astonishment,
- 21 *How soon is the fig-tree withered ! Jesus an-* Mar. 11 ; 22.
swered, Verily I say unto you, if ye have an
unshaken faith, ye may not only do as much as
is done to the fig-tree, but even if ye should
say to this mountain, ‘ Be lifted and thrown into
 22 *‘ the sea,’ it shall be done. Moreover ye shall*
obtain whatsoever ye shall with faith pray for.
- 23 *Being come into the temple, the chief priests* Lu. 20 ; 1-
and the elders of the people came near, as he Mar. 11 ; 28.
was teaching, and said, By what authority dost
thou these things ? and who empowered thee ?
- 24 *Jesus answering, said to them, I also have a*
question to propose, which if ye answer me,
I will tell you by what authority I do these
 25 *things. Whence had John authority to bap-*
tize ? From heaven ; or from men ? Then they
reasoned thus within themselves, ‘ If we say,
‘ From heaven, he will retort, Why then did ye
 26 *‘ not believe him ? And if we say, From men,* ch. 14 ; 5.
‘ we dread the multitude, amongst whom John is

CH. 21.

SECT. XI.

‘*universally accounted a prophet.*’ *They there-*
 27 *fore answered him,* We cannot tell. *Jesus re-*
plied, Neither tell I you by what authority I
 do these things.

28 But what think ye of this? A man had two
 29 sons, and addressing his elder son, said, ‘Son,
 ‘go work to-day in my vineyard.’ He answer-
 ed, ‘I will not,’ but afterwards repented and
 30 went. Then addressing the younger, he bade
 him likewise. He answered, ‘Immediately,
 31 ‘Sir,’ but went not. Now, which of the two
 ‘obeyed his father? *They said,* The first,
Jesus replied, Verily I say unto you, even the
 publicans and the harlots show you the way
 32 into the kingdom of God. For John came to
 you in the way of sanctity, and ye believed
 him not; but the publicans and harlots believ-
 ed him: yet ye who saw this, did not after-
 wards repent and believe him.

ch. 11; 18.
 Lu. 7; 33.

Mar. 12; 1.
 Lu. 20; 9.

33 Hear another parable: A certain landlord
 planted a vineyard, and hedged it round, and
 digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower;
 34 and having farmed it out, went abroad. When
 the vintage approached, he sent his servants to
 35 the husbandmen, to receive the fruits. But
 they seized his servants, beat one, drove away
 36 with stones another, and killed another. Again,
 he sent other servants more respectable; but
 37 they received the same treatment. Finally, he
 sent his son to them; for he said, ‘They will
 38 ‘reverence my son.’ But when the husband-
 men saw the son, they said among themselves,
 ‘This is the heir, come, let us kill him, and

SECT. XI.

CH. 22.

39 'keep possession of his inheritance.' Then they seized him, thrust him out of the vine-
 40 yard, and killed him. When, therefore, the proprietor of the vineyard cometh, what will
 41 he do to those husbandmen? *They answered,* He will put those wretches to a wretched
 death, and will let the vineyard to others who will render him the fruits in the season.

42 *Jesus replied,* Did ye never read in the Scriptures, "A stone which the builders re-
 "jected, is made the head of the corner. This
 "the Lord³³ hath effected, and we behold it
 43 "with admiration." Know, therefore, that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and
 given to a nation who will produce the fruits
 44 thereof. For whosoever shall fall on this stone, shall be bruised; but on whomsoever it
 shall fall, it will crush him to pieces.

45 *The chief priests and the Pharisees hearing his parables, perceived that he spoke of them;*
 46 *but though they wished to lay hold on him, they were afraid of the populace, who reckoned him a Prophet.*

XXII. *Jesus continuing to discourse to them in* Lu. 14; 16.
 2 *parables, said,* The administration of heaven Rev. 19; 9.
 resembleth the conduct of a king, who having
 3 made a marriage-feast for his son, sent his servants, to call them who had been invited; but
 4 they would not come. Then he sent other servants, saying, 'Tell those who are invited,
 'I have prepared my feast, my bullocks and
 'fatlings are slain, and all is ready, come to the

³³ *Jehovah.*

CH. 22.

SECT. XII.

- 5 'marriage.' But they turned away with indifference, one to his farm, another to his merchandize. And the rest seizing his servants, 6 abused and killed them. When the king heard this, being enraged, he sent his soldiers, destroyed those murderers, and burnt their city. 7 Then he said to his servants, 'The entertainment 'is ready; but they who were invited were not 8 'worthy: go, therefore, into the public roads, 'and all that ye find, invite to the marriage.' 9 Accordingly they went into the highways, and assembled all that they found, good and bad, so that the hall was furnished with guests. 10 When the king came in to see the guests, observing one who had not on a wedding-garment, 11 he said to him, 'Friend, how camest thou hither, without a wedding-garment?' And he was 12 speechless. Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and thrust him 'out into darkness, where will be weeping and 13 'gnashing of teeth;' for there are many called, but few chosen.
- ch. 20 ; 16. 14

SECTION XII.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PHARISEES.

- Mar. 12 ; 13. 15 *THEN the Pharisees retired, and having*
Lu. 20 ; 20. *consulted how they might entrap him in his*
16 *words, sent to him some of their disciples, and*
some Herodians³⁴, who being instructed by

³⁴ Partizans of Herod.

SECT. XII.

CH. 22.

them, said, Rabbi, we know that thou art sincere, and faithfully teachest the way of God, without any partiality, for thou respectest not
 17 the person of men. Tell us, therefore, thy opinion : Is it lawful to give tribute to Cesar,
 18 or not? *Jesus perceiving their malice, said, Dissemblers, why would ye entangle me?*
 19 Shew me the tribute money. *And they reach-*
 20 *ed him a denarius*³⁵. *He asked them, Whose*
 21 *image and inscription is this? They answered, Cesar's. He replied, Render, then, to Cesar*
 that which is Cesar's, and to God that which is
 22 God's. *And admiring his answer, they left him and went away.*

23 *The same day came Sadducees to him, who say that there is no future life, and thus ad-*
 24 *dressed him, Rabbi, Moses hath said, 'If one*
 ' die, and have no children, his brother shall
 ' marry his widow, and raise issue to the de-
 25 ' ceased.' Now there lived among us seven
 brothers; the eldest married and died without
 26 issue, leaving his wife to his brother. Thus
 also the second, and the third, and so to the
 27 seventh. Last of all the woman died also.
 28 Now, at the resurrection, whose wife shall she
 29 be of the seven; for they all married her? *Je-*
sus answering, said unto them, Ye err, not
 knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God;
 30 for in that state, they neither marry, nor give in
 marriage; they resemble God's heavenly mes-
 31 sengers. But as to the revival of the dead,

Mar. 12; 18.
 Lu. 20; 27.
 Acts, 23; 8.
 Deu. 25; 5.

³⁵ A Roman coin, value sevenpence halfpenny.

CH. 23.

SECT. XII.

have ye not read what God declared to you,
 Ex. 3; 6 32 saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and the
 "God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." God
 is not a God of the dead, but of the living.
 33 *Now the people who heard this were amazed at
 his doctrine.*

Mar. 12; 28· 34 *Meantime, the Pharisees hearing that he had
 Lu. 10; 25· silenced the Sadducees, flocked about him.*

35 *Then one of them, a lawyer, trying him, pro-
 36 posed this question, Rabbi, which is the great-*

Deut. 6; 5· 37 *est commandment in the law? Jesus answered,
 "Thou shalt love the Lord³⁶ thy God with all*

38 *"thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all
 39 "thy mind." This is the first and greatest com-*

Lev. 19; 18· 39 *mandment. The second is like it, "Thou
 40 "shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." On*

these two commandments the whole law and
 the Prophets depend.

Mar. 12; 35· 41 *While the Pharisees were assembled, Jesus
 Lu. 20; 41· 42 asked them, saying, What think ye of the Mes-*

43 *sed, David's. He replied, How then doth David,
 speaking by inspiration, call him his Lord?*

Ps. 110; 1. 44 *"The Lord³⁷," saith he, "said to my Lord, Sit
 "at my right hand, until I make thy foes thy*

45 *"footstool." If the Messiah were David's
 46 Son, would David call him his Lord? To this*

*none of them could answer; and from that day
 nobody presumed to try him with questions.*

XXIII. *Then Jesus addressed the people and his
 2 disciples, saying, The Scribes and the Phari-*

³⁶ Jehovah.³⁷ Jehovah.

SECT. XII.

CH. 23.

- 3 sees sit in Moses' chair; therefore observe and do whatsoever they enjoin you; nevertheless follow not their example; for they say, and do
- 4 not. Heavy and intolerable burdens they prepare for other men's shoulders, burdens which they themselves will not put a finger to.
- 5 But whatever they do, they do to be observed by men. For this they wear broader phylacteries³⁸ than others, and larger tufts on their
- 6 mantles; and affect the uppermost places at entertainments, and the principal seats in the synagogues, and to be saluted in public places;
- 7 and to hear men addressing them, cry, 'Rabbi,
- 8 'Rabbi.' But as for you, assume not the title of Rabbi; for ye have only one teacher, the
- 9 Messiah: and style no man upon the earth your father, for he alone is your father who is
- 10 in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Neither assume the title of leaders, for ye have only
- 11 one leader, the Messiah. The greatest of you,
- 12 on the contrary, shall be your servant; for whosoever will exalt himself, shall be humbled; and whosoever will humble himself, shall be exalted.
- 13 But woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; and will neither enter yourselves, nor permit others that would, to enter.
- 14 Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye devour the families of

Lu. 11; 46.
 Acts, 15; 10.
 Nu. 15; 38.
 Deut. 6; 8.
 and 22; 12.
 Mar. 12; 38.
 Lu. 11; 43.
 and 20; 46.

Lu. 14; 11.
 and 18; 14.

Lu. 11; 52.

Lu. 20; 47.

³⁸ Scripts of parchment, containing sentences of the law.

CH. 23.

SECT. XII.

widows ; nay, and use long prayers for a disguise. This will but aggravate your punishment.

15 Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye traverse sea and land to make one proselyte³⁹ ; and when he is gained, ye make him a son of hell doubly more than yourselves.

16 Woe unto you, blind guides, who say, ‘ To
 17 ‘ swear by the temple bindeth not, but to swear
 18 ‘ by the gold of the temple is binding.’ Foolish
 19 ‘ and blind ! which is more sacred, the gold,
 20 ‘ or the temple that consecrateth the gold ? and,
 21 ‘ To swear by the altar bindeth not ; but to
 22 ‘ swear by the offering that is upon it is bind-
 23 ‘ ing.’ Foolish and blind ! which is more sacred,
 24 ‘ the offering, or the altar that consecrateth
 25 ‘ the offering ? Whoever, therefore, sweareth by
 26 ‘ the altar, sweareth by it, and by every thing
 27 ‘ thereon. And whoever sweareth by the temple,
 28 ‘ sweareth by it, and by Him who dwelleth
 29 ‘ therein ; and whoever sweareth by heaven,
 30 ‘ sweareth by the throne of God, and by Him
 31 ‘ who sitteth thereon.

Lk. 11 ; 42. 23 Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye pay the tithe of mint, dill, and cummin, and omit the more important articles of the law, justice, humanity and fidelity. These ye ought to have practised, without
 24 omitting those. Blind guides ! who strain your liquor, to avoid swallowing a gnat ; yet swallow a camel.

³⁹ A convert to Judaism.

SECT. XII.

CH. 23.

- 25 Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye cleanse the outside of those cups and platters, which within are laden with rapine and iniquity. Blind Pharisee, begin with cleansing the inside of the cup, and of the platter, if ye would make even the outside clean. Lu. 11; 39.
- 26
- 27 Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye resemble whitened sepulchres, which without indeed are beautiful, but within are full of corruption, and of dead men's bones. Thus ye also outwardly appear righteous to men; but are inwardly fraught with subtilty and injustice.
- 28
- 29 Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye build the sepulchres of the Prophets, and adorn the monuments of the righteous, and say, 'Had we lived in the days of our fathers, we would not have been their accomplices in the slaughter of the Prophets.' Lu. 11; 47.
- 30
- 31 Thus ye testify against yourselves, that ye are the sons of those who murdered the Prophets.
- 32 Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.
- 33 Ah! serpents! offspring of vipers! How can ye escape the punishment of hell?
- 34 Therefore, I send you Prophets, and wise men, and Scribes. Some of them ye will kill and crucify; others ye will scourge in your synagogues, and banish from city to city; so that all the innocent blood shed upon the earth shall be charged upon you, from the blood of righteous Abel, to the blood of Zechariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the altar Lu. 11; 49.
- 35
- Gen. 4; 8.
2 Ch. 24; 20.

CH. 24.

SECT. XIII.

36 and the sanctuary. Verily I say unto you, all shall be charged upon this generation.

Lu. 13; 34. 37 O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! that killest the Prophets, and stonest them whom God sendeth to thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings! but ye would not.

38 Quickly shall your habitation be transformed

Ps. 118; 26. 39 into a desert: for know that ye shall not henceforth see me, until ye say, 'Blessed be he who 'cometh in the name of the Lord'⁴⁰;

SECTION XIII.

THE PROPHECY ON MOUNT OLIVET.

Mar. 13; 1. XXIV. *AS Jesus walked out of the temple, his dis-*
 Lu. 21; 5. *ciples came and made him observe the buildings*
 Lu. 19; 44. *2 of it. Jesus said to them, All this ye see;*
verily I say unto you, one stone shall not be
left here upon another. All shall be razed.

Mar. 13; 3. 3 *As he sat upon the Mount of Olives, his dis-*
 Lu. 21; 7. *ciples accosted him privately, saying, Tell us,*
when will this happen? and what will be the
sign of thy coming, and of the conclusion of
 4 *this state? Jesus answering, said to them, Take*
heed that no man seduce you: for many

⁴⁰ Jehovah.

SECT. XIII.

CH. 24.

5 will assume my character, saying, 'I am the
6 'Messiah,' and will seduce many. Nay, ye
shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; but
take care that ye be not alarmed: for all these
things must happen; but the end is not yet.

7 For nation will arise against nation; and
kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be
famines and pestilences, and earthquakes in
8 sundry places. Yet these are but the prelude
9 of woes. For they will consign you to tor-
ments and to death, and ye shall be hated by
10 all nations on my account. Then many will
be ensnared, and will betray their fellows, and
11 hate them. And many false prophets will
12 arise, who will seduce many. And because
vice will abound, the love of the greater num-
13 ber will cool. But the man who persevereth
14 to the end shall be saved. And this good tid-
ings of the reign shall be published through
all the world, for the information of all nations.
And then shall come the end.

15 When, therefore, ye shall see, on holy
ground, the desolating abomination foretold by
16 the Prophet Daniel, (*Reader attend!*) then let
17 those in Judea flee to the mountains; let not
him who shall be upon the house-top, come
18 down to carry things out of his house; and let
not him who shall be in the field, return to take
19 his mantle. But woe unto the women with
child, and unto them that give suck in those
20 days. Pray therefore that your flight happen
21 not in the winter, nor on the Sabbath; because

Mar. 13; 8.
Lu. 21; 10.
ch. 10; 17.
Jo. 16; 2.

Mar. 13; 14.
Lu. 21; 20.
Dan. 9; 26.

CH. 24.

SECT. XIII.

there shall be then so great tribulation, as hath not been since the beginning of the world until
 22 now, nor shall be ever after. For if the time were protracted, no soul could survive; but for the sake of the elect, the time shall be short.

Mar. 13; 21. 23 If any shall say to you then, 'Lo! the Messiah is here, or he is there,' believe it not: for

Lu. 17; 23. 24 false Messiahs and false prophets will arise, who will perform great wonders and prodigies, so as to seduce, if possible, the elect themselves.

25 Remember I have warned you. Wherefore, if
 26 they cry, 'He is in the desert,' go not out; 'he
 27 'is in the closet,' believe it not. For the coming of the Son of Man shall be like the lighting, which breaking forth from the east, shin-

Lu. 17; 37. 28 eth even unto the west. For wheresoever the carcass is, the eagles will be gathered together.

Mar. 13; 24. 29 Immediately after those days of affliction,
 Lu. 21; 25. the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall withhold her light; and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the heavenly powers shall be

Is. 13; 10. 30 shaken. Then shall appear the sign of the
 Ezek. 32; 7. Son of Man in heaven; and all the tribes of
 Joel. 2; 31. the land shall mourn, when they shall see the
 Rev. 1; 7. Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven

31 with great majesty and power. And he will send his messengers with a loud-sounding trumpet, who shall assemble his elect from the four quarters of the earth, and from one extremity of the world to the other.

Mar. 13; 28. 32 Learn now a similitude from the fig-tree.

Lu. 21; 29. When its branches become tender, and put
 33 forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh. In

SECT. XIII.

CH. 24.

- like manner, when ye shall see all these things ;
 34 know that he is near, even at the door. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not
 35 pass until all these things happen. Heaven and earth shall fail ; but my words shall never fail.
 36 But of that day and that hour knoweth none but my Father, no not the heavenly messengers.
 37 Now that which happened in Noah's time, Lu. 17 ; 26.
 will also happen at the coming of the Son of
 38 Man. For as in the days before the flood, even to that day that Noah entered the ark,
 they were eating and drinking and marrying,
 39 and suspected nothing, until the flood came and swept them all away : so shall it also be
 40 at the coming of the Son of Man. Two men shall be in the field ; one shall be taken, and Lu. 17 ; 35.
 41 one shall escape. Two women shall be grinding at the mill ; one shall be taken, and one shall escape.
 42 Watch, therefore, since ye know not at what Ma. 13 ; 32.
 43 hour your Master will come. Ye are sure that ch. 25 ; 13.
 if the householder knew at what time of the Lu. 12 ; 39.
 night the thief would come, he would watch, and 1 Th. 5 ; 2.
 44 not suffer him to break into his house. Be ye Rev. 3 ; 3.
 therefore always prepared ; because the Son & 16 ; 15.
 of Man will come at an hour when ye are not expecting him.
 45 Who now is the discreet and faithful servant, whom his master hath set over his household,
 to dispense to them regularly their allowance ?
 46 Happy that servant, if his master, at his return,
 47 shall find him so employed. Verily I say unto you, he will entrust him with the management

48 of all his estate. But as to the vicious servant,
 who shall say within himself ‘ My Master de-
 49 ‘ ferreth his return,’ and shall beat his fellow-
 servants, and feast and carouse with drunkards;
 50 the master of that servant will come on a day
 when he is not expecting him, and at an hour
 51 he is not apprized of, and having discarded
 him, will assign him his portion with the per-
 fidious. Weeping and gnashing of teeth shall
 be there.

XXV. Then may the kingdom of heaven be com-
 pared to ten virgins, who went out with their
 2 lamps to meet the bridegroom. Of these five
 3 were prudent, and five foolish. The foolish
 took their lamps, but carried no oil with them.
 4 But the prudent, beside their lamps, carried oil
 5 in their vessels. While the bridegroom tarried,
 6 they all became drowsy and fell asleep. And
 at midnight a cry was raised: ‘ The bride-
 7 ‘ groom is coming, go out and meet him.’ Then
 all the virgins arose and trimmed their lamps.
 8 And the foolish said to the prudent, ‘ Give us
 ‘ of your oil; for our lamps are going out.’
 9 But the prudent answered, saying, ‘ Lest there
 ‘ be not enough for us and you; go rather to
 ‘ them who sell, and buy for yourselves.’
 10 While they went to buy, the bridegroom came,
 and those who were ready, went in with him to
 11 the marriage, and the door was shut. After-
 wards came also the other virgins, saying,
 12 ‘ Master, master, open unto us.’ He answered,
 ‘ Verily I say unto you, I know you not.’
 13 Watch, therefore, because ye know neither the
 day nor the hour.

SECT. XIII.

CH. 25.

14 For the Son of Man is like one who, intend-
 ing to travel, called his servants, and commit-
 15 ted to them his stock; to one he gave five
 talents⁴¹, to another two, and to another one;
 to each according to his respective ability, and
 16 immediately set out. Then he who had re-
 ceived the five talents, went and traded with
 17 them, and gained other five. Likewise he who
 18 had received two, gained other two. Whereas
 he who had received but one, digged a hole in
 19 the ground, and hid his master's money. After a
 long time, their master returned and reckoned
 20 with them. Then he who had received the five
 talents, came and presented other five, saying,
 ' Sir, thou deliveredst to me five talents : here
 ' they are, and other five which I have gained.'
 21 His master answered, ' Well done, good and
 ' faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a
 ' small matter, I will give thee a more import-
 ' ant trust. Partake thou in thy master's joy.'
 22 He also who had received the two talents ad-
 vancing, said, ' Sir, thou deliveredst to me two
 ' talents. Here they are, and other two which
 23 ' I have gained.' His master answered, ' Well
 ' done, good and faithful servant, thou hast
 ' been faithful in a small matter, I will give
 ' thee a more important trust. Partake thou
 24 ' in thy master's joy.' Then came he also who Lu. 19; 20.
 had received the single talent, and said, ' Sir,
 ' I know that thou art a severe man, reaping

⁴¹ A talent thought to be equal to 187l. 10s. sterling.

' where thou hast not sown, and gathering
 25 ' where thou hast not scattered ; being there-
 ' fore afraid, I hid thy talent under ground ; but
 26 ' now I restore thee thine own.' His master
 answering, said unto him, ' Malignant and
 ' slothful servant, didst thou know that I reap
 ' where I have not sown, and gather where I
 27 ' have not scattered ? Shouldst thou not, then,
 ' have given my money to the bankers, that, at
 ' my return, I might have received it with in-
 28 ' terest ? Take from him, therefore, the talent,
 29 ' and give it to him who hath ten : for to every
 ' one that hath, more shall be given, and he
 ' shall abound ; but from him that hath not,
 30 ' even that which he hath shall be taken. And
 ' thrust out this unprofitable servant into dark-
 ' ness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of
 ' teeth.'

31 Now when the Son of Man shall come in
 his glory, accompanied by all the holy angels,
 and shall be seated upon his glorious throne ;

32 then shall all the nations be assembled before
 him ; and out of them he will separate the
 good from the bad, as a shepherd separateth
 33 the sheep from the goats. The sheep he will
 set at his right hand, and the goats at his left.

34 Then will the king say to those at his right
 hand, ' Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit
 ' the kingdom prepared for you from the for-

35 ' mation of the world ; for I was hungry, and
 ' ye gave me food ; I was thirsty, and ye gave
 ' me drink ; I was a stranger, and ye lodged
 36 ' me ; I was naked, and ye clothed me ; I was

ch. 13 ; 12.
 Mar. 4 ; 25.
 Lu. 8 ; 18.
 & 19 ; 26.

Is. 52 ; 7.
 Ezek. 18 ; 7.

SECT. XIII.

CH. 25.

‘ sick, and ye assisted me ; I was in prison,
 ‘ and ye visited me.’ Then the righteous will
 37 answer him, saying, ‘ Lord, when did we see
 ‘ thee hungry, and fed thee ; or thirsty, and
 38 ‘ gave thee drink ? When did we see thee a
 ‘ stranger, and lodged thee ; or naked, and
 39 ‘ clothed thee ? When did we see thee sick,
 40 ‘ or in prison, and visited thee ?’ The king
 will reply to them, ‘ Verily I say unto you,
 ‘ that inasmuch as ye have done this to any
 ‘ the least of these my brethren, ye have done
 ‘ it unto me.’

41 Then he will say to those at his left hand,
 ‘ Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal
 ‘ fire, prepared for the devil and his angels ;
 42 ‘ for I was hungry, but ye gave me no food ; I
 43 ‘ was thirsty, but ye gave no drink ; I was a
 ‘ stranger, but ye did not lodge me ; naked,
 ‘ but ye did not clothe me ; sick, and in prison,
 44 ‘ but ye did not mind me.’ Then they also
 will answer, saying, ‘ Lord, when did we see
 ‘ thee hungry, or thirsty, or a stranger, or nak-
 ‘ ed, or sick, or in prison, and did not assist
 45 ‘ thee ?’ Then he will reply to them, saying,
 ‘ Verily I say unto you, that inasmuch as ye
 ‘ did it not to any the least of these, ye did it
 46 ‘ not to me.’ And these shall go to eternal
 punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

ch. 7 ; 23.
 Lu. 14 ; 27.

Jo. 5 ; 29.
 Dan. 12 ; 1.

SECTION XIV.

THE LAST SUPPER.

Mar. 14; 1.
Lu. 22; 1.
Jo. 11; 47.
& 53.

XXVI. *Jesus having ended this discourse, said to*
 2 *his disciples, Ye know that two days hence*
 cometh the passover. Then the Son of Man
 3 shall be delivered up to be crucified. *About*
this time the chief priests and the Scribes, and
the elders of the people, were convened in the
 4 *palace of Caiaphas the high priest, where they*
consulted how they might take Jesus by surprize
 5 *and kill him. They said, however, Not during*
 the festival, lest there be a commotion among
 the people.

Mar. 14; 3.
Jo. 11; 2.
& 12; 2.

6 *Now Jesus being in Bethany, in the house of*
 7 *Simon [formerly] a leper, a woman came to*
him with an alabaster box of balsam, very pre-
cious, which she poured on his head, while he
 8 *was at table. His disciples observing it, said,*
 9 *with indignation, Why this profusion? This*
 balsam might have been sold for a great price,
 10 and the money given to the poor. *Jesus know-*
ing it, said to them, Why trouble ye the wo-
 11 *man? She hath done me a good office. For*
 ye have the poor always amongst you, but me
 12 ye have not always. For it is to embalm me
 that she hath poured this balsam upon my
 13 body. Verily I say unto you, In what part
 soever of the world the gospel shall be preach-
 ed, what this woman hath now done shall be
 mentioned to her honour.

Deu. 5; 11.

SECT. XIV.

CH. 26.

- 14 *Then one of the twelve, named Judas Iscariot,* Mar. 14 ; 10.
Lu. 22 ; 3.
- 15 *went to the chief priests, and said, What will*
ye give me, and I will deliver him to you ?
- 16 *And they weighed him thirty shekels⁴², and*
from that time he watched an opportunity to
deliver him up.
- 17 *Now on the first day of unleavened bread,* Mar. 14 ; 12.
Lu. 22 ; 7
- 18 *the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Where shall*
18 *we prepare for thee the paschal supper? He*
answered, Go into the city, to such a man, and
tell him, ' The teacher saith, My time is near ;
' I must celebrate the passover at thy house
19 *' with my disciples.' And the disciples did*
as they were ordered, and prepared the pass-
over.
- 20 *In the evening he placed himself at table with* Mar. 14 ; 17.
Lu. 22 ; 21.
- 21 *the twelve ; and while they were eating he said,*
Verily I say unto you, that one of you will de- Jo. 13 ; 21.
Ps. 41 ; 9.
- 22 *liver me up. And they were extremely sorrow-*
ful, and began every one of them to say, Mas-
23 *ter, is it I? He answering, said, The man*
whose hand is in the dish with mine, is he who
24 *betrayeth me. The Son of Man departeth in*
the manner foretold in Scripture concerning
him ; but woe unto that man by whom the
Son of Man is betrayed ; it had been better
25 *for that man never to have been born. Then*
Judas, who betrayed him, said also, Rabbi, is it
I? Jesus answered, It is.
- 26 *As they were eating, Jesus took the loaf, and,* Mar. 14 ; 22.
Lu. 22 ; 14.
1 Co. 11 ; 23.

⁴² About 3l. 15s. sterling.

CH. 26.

SECT. XIV.

having given thanks, broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body.

- 27 *Then he took the cup, and having given thanks, gave it to them, saying, Drink hereof all of you ;*
 28 *for this is my blood, the blood of the new covenant, shed for many, for the remission of sins.*
 29 *I assure you that I will not henceforth drink of the product of the vine, until the day when I shall drink it new with you in my Father's*
 30 *kingdom. And after the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives.*

Mar. 14 ; 27.
 Zech. 13 ; 7.
 Jo. 16 ; 32.
 Mar. 16 ; 7.
 Lu. 22 ; 31.
 Jo. 13 ; 37.

- 31 *Then Jesus said to them, This night I shall prove a stumbling stone to you all ; for it is written, " I will smite the shepherd, and the flock*
 32 *" will disperse." But after I am raised again,*
 33 *I will go before you into Galilee. Peter, thereupon, said to him, Though thou shouldest prove a stumbling stone to them all ; I never*
 34 *will be made to stumble. Jesus answered, Verily I say unto thee, that this very night, before the cock crow, thou wilt thrice disown*
 35 *me. Peter replied, Although I should die with thee, I never will disown thee. And all the disciples said the same.*

Ma. 14 ; 32.
 Lu. 22 ; 40.

- 36 *Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane, and said to his disciples, Stay*
 37 *here, while I go yonder and pray. And he took with him Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee ; and*
 38 *being oppressed with grief, said to them, My soul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguish ; abide*
 39 *here, and watch with me. And going a little before, he threw himself on his face, and praying,*

SECT. XIV.

CH. 26.

said, My Father, remove this cup from me, if it be possible; nevertheless, not as I would, but
 40 as thou wilt. *And he returned to his disciples, and finding them asleep, said to Peter, Is it so, then, that ye could not keep awake with me a*
 41 *a single hour? Watch and pray, that ye be not overcome by temptation; the spirit indeed*
 42 *is willing, but the flesh is weak. A second time he withdrew, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if there be no exemption for me; if I*
 43 *must drink this cup, thy will be done. Upon his return, he again found them sleeping, for their*
 44 *eyes were overpowered. Again, leaving them, he went and prayed the third time, using the*
 45 *same words. Then he came back to his disciples, and said to them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold the hour approacheth, when the Son of Man must be delivered into the*
 46 *hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going; lo! he who betrayeth me is at hand.*

47 *Before he had done speaking, Judas, one of the twelve, appeared with a great multitude, armed with swords and clubs, and sent by the*
 48 *chief priests and elders of the people. Now*
 49 *the betrayer had given them a sign, saying, The man whom I shall kiss is he, secure him. And*
 50 *coming directly to Jesus, he said, Hail Rabbi, and kissed him. Jesus answered, Friend, for what purpose comest thou? Then they advanced, and laying hands on Jesus seized him. Upon*
 51 *this one of Jesus' company laying his hand upon his sword, drew it; and striking the servant of*
 52 *the high priest, cut off his ear. Jesus said to*

Mar. 14; 43.
 Lu. 22; 47.
 Jo. 18; 3.

Gen. 9 ; 6.
Rev. 13 ; 10.

- him*, Sheathe thy sword ; for whoever hath recourse to the sword, shall fall by the sword.
- 53 Thinkest thou that I cannot presently invoke my Father, who would send to my relief more
- 54 than twelve legions of angels⁴³ ? But in that case how should the Scriptures be accomplished, which declare that these things must be ?
- 55 *Then turning to the multitude, he said*, Do ye come with swords and clubs to apprehend me, like people in pursuit of a robber ? I sat daily amongst you, teaching in the temple, and ye
- 56 did not arrest me. But all this hath happened, that the writings of the Prophets might be fulfilled. *Then all the disciples forsook him and fled.*

SECTION XV.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

Mar. 14 ; 53.
Lu. 22 ; 54.
Jo. 18 ; 13.
& 24.

- 57 *NOW* they who had apprehended Jesus, brought him to Caiphas the high priest, with whom the Scribes and elders were assembled.
- 58 *But Peter followed him at a distance, to the court of the high priest's house, and having gone in, sat with the officers to see the issue.*
- 59 *Meantime the chief priests and the elders, and the whole Sanhedrim, sought out false evidence against Jesus, upon which they might con-*

Mar. 14 ; 55.
Lu. 22 ; 66.

⁴³ A Roman legion consisted of 6000 men ; sometimes more, sometimes fewer.

SECT. XV.

CH. 26.

60 *demn him to die. But though many false witnesses appeared, they found it not. At length*
 61 *came two false witnesses, who charged him with saying, 'I can demolish the temple of God,*
 62 *'and rebuild it in three days.' Then the high priest, rising, said to him, Answerest thou nothing to what these men testify against thee? Jesus remaining silent, he added, On the part of the living God, I adjure thee to tell us, whether thou be*
 63 *the Messiah, the Son of God. Jesus answered him, It is as thou sayest: nay, be assured that hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Almighty, and coming*
 64 *on the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest, rending his clothes, said, He hath uttered blasphemy. What further need have we of witnesses, now that ye have heard him blaspheme?*
 65 *What think ye? They answered, He deserveth to die. Then they spat in his face. Some gave him blows on the head, and others struck him on*
 66 *the cheeks, and said, Divine to us, Messiah, who it was that smote thee.*

Jo. 2 ; 19.

Is. 50 ; 6.

69 *Now Peter was sitting without in the court, and a maid servant came to him, and said,*
 70 *Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean. But he denied before them all, saying, I know nothing of the matter. And as he went out into the porch, another maid observing him, said to them,*
 71 *This man too was there with Jesus the Nazarene. Again, he denied, swearing that he knew him not. Soon after some of the bystanders said to Peter, Thou art certainly one of them, for*
 72 *thy speech discovereth thee. Whereupon,*

Mar. 14 ; 66.
 Lu. 22 ; 55.
 Jo. 18 ; 17.
 & 25.

CH. 27.

SECT. XV.

with execrations, and oaths, he asserted that he did not know him; and immediately the cock
 75 *crew. Then Peter remembered the word which*
 ch. 26; 34. *Jesus had said to him, "Before the cock crow, " thou wilt thrice disown me." And he went out and wept bitterly.*

Mar. 15; 1.
 Lu. 23; 1.
 Jo. 18; 28.

XXVII. *WHEN* it was morning, all the chief priests and the elders of the people having consulted against Jesus, how they might procure his death, conducted him bound to Pontius Pilate the procurator, to whom they consigned him.

3 *Then Judas, who had betrayed him, finding that he was condemned, repented; and returning the thirty shekels to the chief priests and*
 4 *the elders, said, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent. They answered, What*
 5 *is that to us? See thou to that. After which,*
 Acts, 1; 18. *having thrown down the money in the temple, he*
 6 *went away and strangled himself. The chief priests taking the money, said, It is not lawful to put it into the sacred treasury, because it is*
 7 *the price of blood. But after deliberating, they bought with it the potter's field to be a*
 8 *burying place for strangers; for which reason that field is to this day called the field of blood.*

Zec. 11; 12.

9 *Then was the word of Jeremiah the Prophet verified, "The thirty shekels, the price at which*
 10 *he was valued, I took, as the Lord⁴⁴ appointed me, from the sons of Israel, who gave them for " the potter's field."*

⁴⁴ Jehovah.

SECT. XV.

CH. 27.

- 11 *Now Jesus appeared before the procurator,* Mar. 15; 2.
Lu. 23; 1.
- 12 *who questioned him, saying, Thou art the King*
- 13 *of the Jews? He answered, Thou sayest right.*
- 14 *But when he was arraigned by the chief priests*
- 15 *and the elders, he made no reply. Then Pilate*
- 16 *said to him, Hearest thou not of how many*
- 17 *crimes they accuse thee? But he answered*
- 18 *not one word, which surprised the procurator*
- 19 *exceedingly.*
- 20 *Now the procurator was wont to release, at* Mar. 15; 6.
Lu. 23; 17.
Jo. 18; 39.
- 21 *the festival, any one of the prisoners whom the*
- 22 *multitude demanded. And they had then a fa-*
- 23 *mous prisoner named Barabbas. Therefore,*
- 24 *when they were assembled, Pilate said to them,*
- 25 *Whom shall I release to you? Barabbas, or*
- 26 *Jesus who is called Messiah?—(For he per-*
- 27 *ceived that, through envy, they had delivered*
- 28 *him up; besides, while he was sitting on the*
- 29 *tribunal, his wife sent him this message, ‘Have*
- 30 *‘thou nothing to do with that innocent person;*
- 31 *‘for, to-day, I have suffered much, in a dream,*
- 32 *‘on his account.’) But the chief priests and*
- 33 *the elders instigated the populace to demand*
- 34 *Barabbas, and cause Jesus to be executed.*
- 35 *Therefore, when the procurator asked which*
- 36 *of the two he should release, they all answered,*
- 37 *Barabbas. Pilate replied, What then shall I* Acts, 3; 14.
- 38 *do with Jesus, whom they call Messiah? They*
- 39 *all answered, Let him be crucified. The pro-*
- 40 *curator said, Why? what evil hath he done?*
- 41 *But they cried the louder, saying, Let him be*
- 42 *crucified. Pilate perceiving that he was so far*

from prevailing, that they grew more tumultuous, took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am guiltless of the blood
 25 of this innocent person. See ye to it. And all the people answering said, His blood be upon
 26 us, and upon our children. Then he released Barabbas to them, and having caused Jesus to be scourged, delivered him up to be crucified.

Mar. 15; 16.
 Jo. 19; 1.
 Ps. 22; 16.

27 After this the procurator's soldiers took Jesus into the pretorium⁴⁵, where they gathered
 28 around him all the band. And having stripped
 29 him, they robed him in a scarlet cloak, and crowned him with a wreath of thorns, and put a rod in his right hand, and kneeling before him
 30 in mockery, cried, Hail, King of the Jews. And spitting upon him, they took the rod, and struck
 31 him with it on the head. When they had mocked him, they disrobed him again, and having put his own raiment on him, led him away to crucify him.

Mar. 15; 21.
 Lu. 23; 26.
 33.
 Jo. 19; 17.

32 As they went out of the city, they met one Simon a Cyrenian, whom they constrained to carry
 33 the cross; and being arrived at a place called Golgotha, which signifies a place of
 34 skulls, they gave him to drink vinegar, mixed with wormwood, which, having tasted it, he would not
 35 drink. After they had nailed him to the cross, they parted his garments by lot; [thus verifying the words of the Prophet, "They shared
 36 "my mantle among them, and cast lots for my
 "vesture."'] And having sat down there they

Ps. 22; 18.

⁴⁵ The governor's palace, or hall of audience.

SECT. XV.

CH. 27.

37 guarded him. *And over his head they placed this inscription, denoting the cause of his death.*

THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE

38 **JEWES.** *Two robbers also were crucified with him, one at his right hand, and the other at his left.*

39 *Meanwhile the passengers reviled him, shaking their heads, and saying,* Mar. 15 ; 29.
Lu. 23 ; 35. Thou who demolishest the temple, and rebuildest it in three days : if thou be God's Son, come down from

40 the cross. *The chief priests also, with the scribes, the elders, and the Pharisees, deriding him, said,* Jo. 2 ; 19. He saved others : cannot he save

41 himself ? If he be king of Israel, let him now descend from the cross, and we will believe Ps. 22 ; 8.

42 him. He trusted in God. Let God deliver Wis. 2 ; 16. him now, if he regard him ; for he called him-

43 self God's Son. *The robbers too, his fellow-sufferers, upbraided him in the same manner.*

44 *Now from the sixth⁴⁶ hour to the ninth⁴⁷, the whole land was in darkness. About the ninth⁴⁸ hour, Jesus cried aloud, saying,* Mar. 15 ; 33.
Lu. 22 ; 44.
Ps. 22 ; 1. Eli, eli, lama sabachthani ! that is, " *My God, my God, why*

45 *hast thou forsaken me ?*" *Some of the bystanders hearing this, said,* He calleth Elijah.

46 *Instantly one of them ran, fetched a sponge, and soaked it in vinegar, and having fastened*

47 *it to a stick, presented it to him to drink. The rest said,* Forbear, we shall see whether

⁴⁶ Twelve o'clock, noon.

⁴⁷ Three, afternoon.

⁴⁸ Three, afternoon.

CII. 27.

SECT. XVI.

50 Elijah will come to save him. *Jesus having again cried with a loud voice, resigned his spirit.*

Mar. 15; 38.
Lu. 23; 45.

51 *And behold the veil of the temple was rent in*
52 *two from top to bottom, the earth trembled,*
53 *and the rocks split. Graves also burst open,*
and after his resurrection, the bodies of several
saints who slept were raised, came out of the
graves, went into the holy city, and were seen
54 *by many. Now the centurion, and they who*
with him guarded Jesus, observing the earth-
quake, and what passed, were exceedingly ter-
rified, and said, This was certainly the Son of
God.

Mar. 15; 40.
Lu. 23; 55.

55 *Several women also were there, looking on at*
a distance, who had followed Jesus from Gali-
56 *lee, assisting him with their service. Among*
them were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the
mother of James and Joses, and the mother of
Zebedee's sons.

SECTION XVI.

THE RESURRECTION.

Mar. 15; 42.
Lu. 23; 50.
Jo. 19; 38.

57 *IN the evening, a rich Arimathean named Jo-*
58 *seph, who was himself a disciple of Jesus, went*
to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. Pi-
late having given orders to deliver it to Joseph;
59 *he took the body, wrapped it in clean linen,*
6 *and deposited it in his own monument, which he*

SECT. XVI.

CH. 28.

had newly caused to be hewn in the rock ; and having rolled a great stone to the entrance, he
61 went away. Now Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary were there, sitting over against the sepulchre.

62 On the morrow, being the day after the preparation⁴⁹, the chief priests and the Pharisees
63 repaired in a body to Pilate, and said, My lord, we remember that this impostor, when
alive, said, " Within three days I shall be
64 " raised." Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be guarded for three days, lest his disciples come by night and steal him, and say to the people, ' He is raised from the dead ;' for this last imposture would prove worse than the
65 first. Pilate answered, Ye have a guard, make the sepulchre as secure as ye can. Accordingly they went and secured it, sealing the stone, and posting guards.

XXVIII. *SABBATH*⁵⁰ being over, and the first Mar. 16 ; 1.
Jo. 20 ; 1. day⁵¹ of the week beginning to dawn, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary went to visit
2 the sepulchre. Now there had been a great earthquake ; for a messenger of the Lord had descended from heaven, who, having rolled the
3 stone from the entrance, sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his apparel
4 white as snow. Seeing him, the guards quaked
5 with terror, and became as dead men. But the

⁴⁹ The Preparation is our Friday.

⁵⁰ With us Saturday.

⁵¹ With us Sunday.

- angel said to the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus who was crucified.*
- 6 *He is not here; for he is risen as he foretold.*
- 7 *Come see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly say to his disciples, 'He is risen 'from the dead; behold he goeth before you 'to Galilee, where ye shall see him.' Take notice: I have told you.*
- 8 *Instantly they went out from the monument with fear and great joy, and ran to inform his*
- 9 *disciples. When they were gone, Jesus himself met them, saying, Rejoice. Upon which they prostrated themselves before him, and em-*
- 10 *braced his feet. Then Jesus said to them, Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren to repair to Galilee, and there they shall see me.*
- 11 *They were no sooner gone than some of the guard went into the city, and informed the chief*
- 12 *priests of all that had happened. These after meeting and consulting with the elders, gave a large sum to the soldiers, with this injunction,*
- 13 *Say, 'His disciples came by night and stole*
- 14 *'him while we were asleep.' And, if this come to the procurator's ears, we will appease*
- 15 *him and indemnify you. So they took the money and acted agreeably to their instructions. Accordingly this report is current among the Jews to this day.*
- 16 *Now the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain whither Jesus had appointed them*
- 17 *to repair. When they saw him, they threw themselves prostrate before him; yet some*
- 18 *doubted. Jesus came near, and said to them,*

SECT. XVI.

CH. 28.

All authority is given to me in heaven and upon
19 the earth ; go, therefore, convert all the nations, Mar. 16 ; 15.
baptizing them in the name of the Father, and
20 of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching
them to observe all the things which I have
commanded you : and behold ! I am with you
always, even to the conclusion of this state.
Amen.

*Over the words of Matthew
Nov 6 1873*

... the ... of ...
... the ... of ...
... the ... of ...
... the ... of ...
... the ... of ...

PREFACE

TO

MARK'S GOSPEL.

THAT the Gospel was written by Mark which is commonly ascribed to him, and that it was the second in the order of time, are points for which the unanimous voice of antiquity can evidently be pleaded. The first authority to be produced, in support of both these articles, is Papias, to whom, as the oldest witness, and, consequently, in a case of this nature, the most important, we are chiefly indebted for what has been advanced in relation to the Evangelist Matthew. What he says concerning Mark may be thus rendered from the words of Eusebius¹ who quotes him: "This is what was related by the elder (that is, John, not the Apostle, but a disciple of Jesus;) Mark being Peter's interpreter, wrote exactly whatever he remembered, not indeed in the order wherein things

¹ Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 39.

“ were spoken and done by the Lord ; for he was
 “ not himself a hearer or follower of our Lord, but
 “ he afterwards, as I said, followed Peter, who
 “ gave instructions as suited the occasions, but
 “ not as a regular history of our Lord’s teaching.
 “ Mark, however, committed no mistake in writing
 “ such things as occurred to his memory : for of
 “ this one thing he was careful, to omit nothing
 “ which he had heard, and to insert no falsehood
 “ into his narrative.” Such is the testimony of
 Papias, which is the more to be regarded, as he
 assigns his authority. He spoke not from hearsay,
 but from the information he had received from a
 most credible witness, John the elder or presbyter,
 a disciple of Jesus, and companion of the Apostles,
 by whom he had been intrusted with a ministry
 in the church.

§ 2. It would be superfluous here to add other testimonies. Suffice it to say, that what is above advanced by Papias, on the authority of John, is contradicted by no person. It is, on the contrary, confirmed by all who take occasion to mention the subject. I shall only subjoin the account given by Irenæus, because it serves to ascertain another circumstance, namely, that the publication of Mark’s Gospel, the second in the order of time, soon followed that of Matthew’s. After telling us that Matthew published his Gospel, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, he adds² : “ After

² Adv. Hær. l. iii. c. 1.

“ their departure [*ἐξοδον*,] Mark also, the disciple “ and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us, in writing, the things which had been preached by “ Peter ?” The Greek *ἐξοδος*, like the English word *departure*, and the word used in the old Latin edition, *excessus*, is equivocal ; it may either denote *death*, which is a departure out of this world, or a mean departure out of the city. It is probably in the former of these senses that the word is here used. Yet by the accounts given by some others, Mark’s Gospel was published in Peter’s lifetime, and had his approbation. But not to insist on matters which cannot now be ascertained, it sufficeth us, that we know by whom this Gospel was written, and whence the writer drew his information. Indeed this latter point has, from the earliest times, been considered as so well authenticated, that some have not scrupled to denominate this *the Gospel according to Peter*. They did not intend thereby to dispute Mark’s title to be esteemed the writer, but to express, in a stronger manner, that every thing here advanced, had the sanction of that Apostle’s testimony, than whom no disciple more closely attended our Lord’s ministry, from its commencement to its consummation. The Gospel of Mark is said, by some, to be but two years posterior in date to that of Matthew. About this, however, it is in vain to think to arrive at any certainty.

§ 3. BUT as to the person here named Mark, authors are not equally agreed. Some have

thought that it was he of whom mention is several times made in the Acts, and some of Paul's Epistles, who is called *John*, whose surname is *Mark*, whose mother's name was *Mary*³, and of whom we are likewise told, that he was sister's son to *Barnabas*⁴. From the little we are able to collect out of the apostolical writings, it appears to me rather improbable, that this is he. Of *John*, surnamed *Mark*, one of the first things we learn is, that he attended *Paul* and *Barnabas* in their apostolical journeys, when these two travelled together⁵. And when, afterwards, there arose a dispute between them concerning him, insomuch that they separated, *Mark* accompanied his uncle *Barnabas*, and *Silas* attended *Paul*. When *Paul* was reconciled to *Mark*, which was probably soon after (for though, among good men, there may arise differences, as these differences are not embittered by any malignity of disposition, a reconciliation is easily effected,) we find *Paul* again employing *Mark's* assistance, recommending him, and giving him a very honourable testimony⁶. But we hear not a syllable of his attending *Peter*, as his minister, or assisting him in any capacity. This is so different from the accounts which the most ancient writers give of the Evangelist *Mark* that, though they cannot be said to contradict each other, they can hardly be supposed as spoken of the same individual. The Evangelist is not said to have derived

³ Acts, xii. 12.

⁴ Col. iv. 10.

⁵ Acts, xii. 25. xiii. 5.

⁶ Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

any part of his information from our Lord himself, or even from any of his Apostles, except the Apostle Peter, (for no other is ever named,) whose disciple he is always represented as having been; and who, doubtless, speaks of him when he says⁷, *Marcus my son saluteth you*. The denomination *son* was, in those times, commonly given, by the minister, to every one who, by his means, had been converted to the Christian faith. But, as to the nephew of Barnabas, we have seen how differently he is represented in the Acts, as well as in Paul's Epistles. And if we recur to tradition (for historical evidence cannot be pretended,) it represents him as having been a disciple of our Lord, and one of the Seventy, whom Jesus in his lifetime sent out to preach the Gospel. Besides, no ancient author, in speaking of this Evangelist, ever calls him John, but always Mark. In brief, the accounts given of Paul's attendant, and those of Peter's interpreter, concur in nothing but the name, Mark, or Marcus; too slight a circumstance to evince the sameness of the person, especially when we consider how common the name was at Rome, and how customary it was for the Jews, in that age, to assume some Roman name when they went thither.

§ 4. FURTHER, that Mark wrote his Gospel in Greek, is as evidently conformable to the testimony of antiquity, as that Matthew wrote his in

⁷ 1 Pet. v. 13.

Hebrew. Cardinal Baronius is the only person who has strenuously maintained the contrary, affirming that this Evangelist published his work in Latin. I know no argument, worthy the name of argument, but one, that he produces in support of his opinion. The external evidence of testimony is clear against him; but something like internal probability may be urged in favour of his sentiment. ‘This Gospel,’ says the Cardinal, ‘was published at Rome, for the benefit of the Romans. Can we then suppose it would be written in any other than the language of the place?’ I shall admit that this Gospel was published at Rome; though that is not universally believed, some rather supposing it to have been at Alexandria, after Mark had been entrusted with the superintendance of that church; but, though the design of the publication had been the benefit of those residing at Rome, it would not have been exclusively intended for the natives. Let it be observed, that the ministry of Peter, to whom Paul tells us⁸, the Gospel of the circumcision was committed, was chiefly employed in converting and instructing his countrymen the Jews, who abounded at that time in the imperial city. Now it was customary with such of the Jews as went abroad (I may say generally with travellers of all nations, especially from the East,) to make themselves masters of the Greek tongue, which was become a kind of universal language, and was more used by strangers at Rome, than the language of the place. It was with such

⁸ Gal. ii. 7.

that the first Christian missionaries were principally concerned. The Apostle Paul accordingly wrote to them in Greek, and not in Latin, which would not have been done, if the former language had not been then better understood in the Christian congregation than the latter. Now, if there was no impropriety in Paul's writing them a very long Epistle in Greek, neither was there any in Mark's giving them his Gospel in that language. The only thing I know which looks like an ancient testimony in favour of the opinion of Baronius, is the inscription subjoined to this Gospel in Syriac, and in some other Oriental versions. But it ought to be remembered, that these postscripts are not the testimonies of the translators. They proceed merely from the conjecture of some transcriber, but when written, or by whom, is equally unknown. But enough, perhaps too much, for setting aside a mere hypothesis, not only unsupported by positive evidence, but in direct contradiction to it.

§ 5. FROM this Gospel, as well as from the former, we should readily conclude that the author was by birth and education a Jew. The Hebraisms in the style (or examples of what has been called the idiom of the synagogue) are very evident throughout the whole. At the same time, as some critics have observed, there are several expressions here used, which clearly indicate that the writer had been accustomed, for some time, to live among the Latins. Not only does he use the Latin words, which are to be found in other Gospels, and seem

to have been then current in Judea, as *λεγεων* a *legion*, *κηνσος* *tribute*, *πρατωριον* *prætorium*, and *δηναριον* a *denarius*; but he employs some which are peculiar to himself, as *κεντυριων* *centurion*, *σπεκουλατωρ* *sentinel*, and *ξεστης* from *sextarius*, a *pot*; for such transpositions of letters are not uncommon in order to avoid a collision which the language does not admit. These have been pleaded as evidences that the original was Latin; but, in fact, they are much stronger marks of a Greek writer who had lived some years among the Latins, and had been accustomed to use, and hear used by others, such names of offices as were familiarly known in the place. Nothing is more common with travellers, than to interlard their conversation with such foreign words as those now described. This is not always, as people are apt to suspect, the effect of affectation: for it is manifest from experience, that such words, in consequence of the recent habit, do most readily suggest themselves to the memory of the speaker or writer, even though using a different tongue. There are some other internal evidences which have not escaped the notice of the inquisitive, that this Gospel was written in a country of strangers, or at least beyond the confines of Judea, where the names of places, and the peculiar phrases relating to religious ceremonies, could not be so familiar to the people, not even to the Jews, as they would be in any part of Palestine. The first time the Jordan is mentioned⁹, *ποταμος* is added to the

⁹ Ch. i. 5.

name for explanation : for though no person in Judea needed to be informed that Jordan is a river, the case was different in distant countries. The word *γεεννα* which, on account of its figurative application in the New Testament, is, in English, always rendered *hell*, is, strictly and originally, the name of a place near Jerusalem, *the valley of Hinnom*, where infants had been sacrificed by fire to Moloch, a place well known to the inhabitants of the country, though perfectly unknown to those of Italy or Egypt. This Evangelist, therefore, when he mentions it¹⁰, very properly adds for explanation, *το πυρ το ασβεστον*, *the unquenchable fire*. Words and phrases not used out of Palestine and the neighbouring regions, are either not named by him at all, or attended, as the above example, with some circumstance which may serve to explain them. Thus he avoids altogether the word *Mammon* used by Matthew and Luke, which, though familiar in Judea, and perhaps through all Syria, might not have been understood even by the Hellenist Jews at Rome. He therefore makes the common term *χρηματα* *riches*, which could not be mistaken any where, supply its place ; and though he finds it convenient, on one occasion¹¹, to employ the Oriental word *Corban*, he immediately subjoins the interpretation *ο εστι δωρον*, *that is, a gift*. In another place¹², he adopts the terms *κοινας χερσι*, which, though not Oriental words, make a sort of Oriental phraseology, that would be unintelligible to the far greater part of

¹⁰ Ch. ix. 43. 45.¹¹ Ch. vii. 11.¹² Ch. vii. 2.

Greek readers. For this reason he immediately explains himself by adding, *τουτ' εστιν, ανιπτοις ; that is, unwashen.* Add to this, that the rite there alluded to is, in the following verses, explained in a manner which, to one in Matthew's circumstances, who wrote for the immediate use of the natives of Judea, familiarized to such observances, must have appeared entirely superfluous. The woman from the confines of Tyre and Sidon, who applied to our Lord, in behalf of her daughter, is, by Matthew who wrote in Hebrew, for the use of the Hebrews, very properly, in the style of their ancient scripture, called *Canaanitish*, and is, not less suitably, by Mark who wrote in Greek, for the benefit of all who spoke that language, denominated *Syrophenician*. When the two Gospels, Matthew's and Mark's are, on these points, compared together, though the particulars in the comparison, taken severally, appear inconsiderable, they bear such strong internal characters as serve greatly to corroborate the historical proof we have relating to their respective authors and languages, to the circumstances of time, and place of publication, as well as to the people for whose use they were respectively written. Such little points, which have nothing of the ostentation of evidence, will be admitted, by the judicious, to have the more weight, on that very account. And, let it be observed that, though the church of Rome, in that early period, and the same may be affirmed of the church of Alexandria, consisted mostly of Hellenist Jews, it was not confined to these. The sacred writers, therefore, who wrote in Greek, chose very

properly, so far to adapt their expressions as to be at least intelligible to other readers of that language.

§ 6. THERE are some peculiarities of style which have been observed in this writer, such as the more frequent use of the adverbs *ευθως* and *ευθεως*, than is found in any other writer in the New Testament, his beginning sentences oftener with *και*, and *και ελεγεν αυτοις*, idioms not unfrequent with the rest. Augustin considers this Evangelist as the abridger of Matthew. *Marcus Matthæum subsequutus tanquam pedisequus et breviator ejus videtur.* It is indeed true that Mark sometimes copies the very expressions used by Matthew. That he is not, however, to be considered as an abridger, may be evinced by the following reasons: First, he omits altogether several things related by Matthew, our Lord's pedigree, his birth, the visit of the Magians, Joseph's flight into Egypt, the cruelty of Herod. As his intention appears to have been to give in brief the history of our Lord's ministry, he begins very properly with the preaching of the Baptist. Again, there are some other things in Matthew, whereof, though they fall within the time to which Mark had confined himself, he has taken no notice; and some things are mentioned by Mark which had been overlooked by Matthew. Further, he has not always followed the same arrangement with his predecessor: and his relation of some facts, so far from being an abridgement of Matthew's, is the more circumstantial of the two. His style in general, instead of

being more concise, is more diffuse. That he had read Matthew's Gospel cannot be doubted. For their exact conformity in expression in several places, Grotius has an ingenious manner of accounting. He supposes that Mark had carefully read Matthew's Gospel in the original Hebrew, before it was translated into Greek; and that he had the particulars fresh in his memory, when he was occupied in writing his Gospel. Again, he supposes that the translator of Matthew into Greek has thought it safest to adopt the expressions of Mark, wherever they would suit the Hebrew, from which he was translating. But this, it must be confessed, though not implausible, is mere conjecture. It is generally our Lord's discourses which are abridged by Mark. As to his miracles, he has rather more fully related them. The additional circumstances and incidents recorded in this Gospel, appear to rest upon the authority of the Apostles, but principally on that of Peter.

THE
GOSPEL BY MARK.

SECTION I.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

I. *THE beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ
Son of God.*

- 2 *As it is written in the Prophets, "Behold I* Mat. 3; 1.
"send mine angel before thee, who shall prepare Lu. 3; 1.
3 *"thy way:" "The voice of one proclaiming in* Jo. 1; 6.
"the wilderness, Prepare a way for the Lord"¹³, Mal. 3; 1.
Is. 40; 3.
4 *"make for him a straight passage:" thus came* Jo. 1; 25.
John baptizing in the wilderness, and publish-
ing the baptism of reformation for the remission

¹³ Jehovah.

5 of sins. *And all the country of Judea, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem resorted to him, and were baptized by him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. Now John's clothing was of camel's hair, tied round his waist with a leathern girdle: and he lived upon locusts and wild honey. And he proclaimed, saying, One mightier than I cometh after me, whose shoe-latchet I am unworthy to stoop down and untie. I indeed have baptized you in water; but he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit.*

Mat. 3; 13.
Lu. 3; 21.
Jo. 1; 31.

9 *At that time Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized by John in Jordan.*
10 *As soon as he arose out of the water, he saw the sky part asunder, and the Spirit descend upon him like a dove. And a voice was heard from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son in whom I delight.*

Mat. 4; 1.
Lu. 4; 1.

12 *Immediately after this the Spirit conveyed him into the wilderness: and he continued there in the wilderness forty days tempted by Satan¹⁴; and was among the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him.*

Mat. 4; 12.
Lu. 4; 15.
Jo. 4; 43.

14 *But after John's imprisonment, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good tidings of the reign of God. The time, said he, is accomplished, the reign of God approacheth; reform, and believe the good tidings.*

Mat. 4; 18.
Lu. 5; 1.
Jo. 1; 35.

16 *Then walking by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon, and Andrew, Simon's brother, casting a drag into the sea, for they were fishers. Jesus*
17 *drag into the sea, for they were fishers. Jesus*

SECT. I.

CH. I.

said to them, Come with me, and I will make
 18 you become fishers of men. *Immediately they*
 19 *left their nets, and followed him. Passing on a*
little, and seeing James, son of Zebedee, with
John his brother, who were mending their nets
 20 *in a bark; he immediately called them: where-*
upon leaving their father Zebedee in the bark
with the hired servants, they accompanied him.

21 *And they went to Capernaum; and on the* Lu. 4; 31.
Sabbath, he repaired directly to the synagogue, Mat. 7; 28.
 22 *and instructed the people, who were aston-*
ished at his manner of teaching; for he taught as
one having authority, and not as the Scribes.

23 *Now there was in their synagogue a man* Lu. 4; 33.
possessed with an unclean spirit, who cried out,
 24 *Ah! Jesus of Nazareth, what hast thou to do*
with us? Art thou come to destroy us? I know
 25 *who thou art, the holy one of God. Jesus re-*
buking him, said, Be silent, and come out of
 26 *him. Then the unclean spirit threw him into*
convulsions, and raising loud cries, came out of
 27 *him: at which they were all so amazed, that*
they asked one another, What meaneth this?
What new teaching is this? for he command-
 28 *eth with authority even the unclean spirits, and*
they obey him. And thenceforth his fame
spread through all the region of Galilee.

29 *As soon as they were come out of the syna-* Mat. 8; 14.
gogue, they went with James and John into the
 30 *house of Simon and Andrew, where Simon's*
wife's mother lay sick of a fever, whereof
 31 *they immediately acquainted Jesus. And he*
came, and taking her by the hand, raised her;

CH. 1.

SECT. I.

instantly the fever left her, and she entertained them.

32 *In the evening, after sun-set, they brought to*
 33 *him all the sick, and the demoniacs ; the whole*
 34 *city being assembled at the door. And he heal-*
ed many persons affected with various diseases,
and expelled many demons, whom he permitted
not to speak, because they knew him.

Lu. 4 ; 41.

35 *On the morrow, having risen before the dawn,*
he went out and retired to a solitary place, and
 36 *prayed there. And Simon and his company*
 37 *went in quest of him, and having found him,*
 38 *said to him, Every body seeketh thee. Jesus*
said, Let us go to the neighbouring boroughs
to proclaim [the reign] there also ; for I came
 39 *out with this design. Accordingly he proclaim-*
ed it in their synagogues throughout all Galilee,
and expelled demons.

Mat. 8 ; 2.
Lu. 5 ; 12.

40 *And a leper came to him, and on his knees*
entreated him, saying, If thou wilt, thou canst
 41 *cleanse me. Jesus had compassion, and*
stretched out his hand and touching him, said, I
 42 *will, be thou cleansed. This he had no soon-*
er uttered, than the leprosy departed from the
 43 *man, and he was cleansed. Then Jesus strictly*
 44 *charging him, and dismissing him, said, See thou*
tell nothing of this to any man ; but go, show
thyself to the priest ; and offer for thy cleans-
ing, the things prescribed by Moses, that it
 45 *may be notified to the people. But the man,*
as soon as he was gone, began to blaze this
story, talking openly every where, insomuch that
Jesus could no longer appear publicly in the

Lev. 14 ; 2.

SECT. I.

CH. 2.

city; but remained without in solitary places, whither the people resorted to him from all parts.

II. *AFTER* many days he returned to Capernaum; and when it was known that he was in the house, such a multitude flocked thither, that there was no room for them, not even near the door, and he taught them the word [of God.]

3 A paralytic was then brought, carried by four Mat. 9; 1.
Lu. 5; 18.
4 men, who not being able to come nigh him for the crowd, uncovered the place where Jesus was, and through the opening let down the couch
5 whereon the paralytic lay. Jesus perceiving their faith, said to the paralytic, Son, thy sins Lu. 7; 48.
6 are forgiven thee. But certain Scribes who were present, reasoned thus within themselves:
7 'How doth this man speak such blasphemies?
8 'Who can forgive sins but God?' Jesus immediately knowing in himself that they made these reflections, said to them, Why do ye reason
9 thus within yourselves? Which is easier, to say to the paralytic, 'Thy sins are forgiven,' or to say [with effect,] 'Arise, take up thy
10 'couch and walk?' But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power upon the earth to
11 forgive sins; rise (*he said to the paralytic,*) I command thee, take up thy couch and go
12 home. Immediately he arose, took up the couch, and walked out before them all; inso-
much that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw any thing like this.
13 Again, he went out towards the sea, and all

Mat. 9 ; 9.
Lu. 5 ; 27.

the multitude repaired to him, and he taught
14 *them. Passing along, he saw Levi, son of Al-*
pheus, sitting at the toll office, and said to him,
Follow me. And he arose and followed him.

15 *Now when Jesus was eating in this man's*
house, several publicans and sinners placed
themselves at table with him and his disciples :

16 *for many of these people followed him. The*
Scribes and the Pharisees, seeing him eat with
publicans and sinners, said to his disciples,
Wherefore doth he eat and drink with publi-
17 *cans and sinners? Jesus hearing this, replied,*
The whole need not a physician, but the sick.
I came not to call the righteous, but sinners,
[to reformation.]

Mat. 9 ; 14.
Lu. 5 ; 33.

18 *The disciples of John, and those of the Phari-*
sees, accustomed to fasting, came to him, and
said, John's disciples, and those of the Phari-

19 *sees, fast ; why do not thy disciples fast? Jesus*
answered, Do the bridemen fast while the
bridegroom is with them? While the bride-

20 *groom is with them they do not fast. But the*
days will come when the bridegroom shall be
taken from them ; and in those days they will

21 *fast. Nobody seweth a piece of undressed*
cloth on an old garment ; otherwise the new
patch teareth the old cloth, and maketh a

22 *worse rent. Nobody putteth new wine into*
old leathern bottles ; else the new wine burst-
eth the bottles ; and thus both the wine is
spilt, and the bottles are rendered useless ; but
new wine must be put into new bottles.

Mat. 12 ; 1.
Lu. 6 ; 1.

23 *Once, when he was going through the corn*
on the Sabbath, his disciples began to pluck the

SECT. 1.

CH. 3.

24 ears of corn, as they went. *The Pharisees*
said to him, Why do they that which, on the
 25 *Sabbath, it is unlawful to do? He answered,* 1 Sa. 21; 1.
Did ye never read what David and his attend-
ants did, in a strait, when they were hungry,
 26 *how he entered the tabernacle of God, in the*
days of Abiathar the high priest, and ate the
loaves of the presence, which none but the
priests could lawfully eat, and gave thereof
 27 *also to his attendants? He added, The Sabbath*
was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.
 28 *Therefore the Son of Man is master even of*
the Sabbath. Nov. 10, 1853.

III. *Another time he entered the synagogue, when* Mat. 12; 9.
a man was there who had a withered hand. Lu. 6; 6.

2 *And they, with a design to accuse Jesus, watch-*
ed him, to see whether he would heal the man
 3 *on the Sabbath. Jesus said to the man who*
had the withered hand, Stand up in the midst.
 4 *Then he said to them, Whether is it lawful to*
do good on the Sabbath, or to do evil; to save,
 5 *or to kill? But they were silent. And looking*
round on them with anger, being grieved for
the blindness of their minds, he said to the man,
Stretch out thy hand: and as he stretched out
 6 *his hand, it became sound like the other. And*
the Pharisees went out immediately, and con-
spired with the Herodians against him, to de-
stroy him.

7 *But Jesus withdrew with his disciples towards*
the sea, whither a great multitude followed him
 8 *from Galilee, from Judea, from Jerusalem, from*

*Idumea*¹⁵, and from the banks of the Jordan. They also of the territories of Tyre and Sidon, having heard what wonders he had performed,

9 flocked to him in crowds. Then he ordered his disciples to get a boat to attend him, because of

10 the multitude, lest they should throng him : for he had healed many, which made all who had

11 maladies press upon him to touch him. And the unclean spirits, when they beheld him, prostrated themselves before him, crying, Thou art

12 the Son of God. But he strictly charged them not to make him known.

 SECTION II.

THE NOMINATION OF APOSTLES.

Mat. 10 ; 1
 Lu. 6 ; 12
 ch. 6 ; 7

13 **AFTERWARDS** Jesus went up a mountain, and called to him whom he would, and they

14 went to him. And he selected twelve, that they might attend him, and that he might commis-

15 sion them to proclaim [the reign,] empowering them to cure diseases, and to expel demons.

16 These were Simon, whom he surnamed Peter,

17 and James, son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James. These he surnamed Boanerges,

18 that is, sons of thunder ; and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James son of Alpheus, and Thad-

¹⁵ In the Old Testament commonly *Edom*.

SECT. II.

CH. 3.

19 *deus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot who betrayed him.*

20 *Then they went into a house, whither the people again crowded so fast, that Jesus and his*

21 *disciples could not so much as eat. His kinsmen hearing this, went out to lay hold on him,*

22 *for they said, He is beside himself. But the Scribes who came from Jerusalem said, He is confederate with Beelzebub, and expelleth de-*

23 *mons by the prince of the demons. Jesus having called them, said to them by similitude,*

24 *How can Satan expel Satan? If a kingdom be torn by factions, that kingdom can-*

25 *not subsist. And if a family be torn by factions, that family cannot subsist. Thus, if*

26 *Satan fight against himself, and be divided, he cannot subsist, but is near his end. No one*

27 *who entereth the strong one's house, can plunder his goods, unless he first overpower the*

28 *strong one; then, indeed, he may plunder his house. Verily I say unto you, that though all*

29 *other sins in the sons of men are pardonable, and whatever detractions they shall utter;*

30 *whosoever shall detract from the Holy Spirit, shall never be pardoned, but is liable to eter-*

31 *nal punishment. [He said this,] because they affirmed that he was leagued with an unclean spirit.*

32 *Meanwhile came his mother and brothers, who standing without, sent for him. And the*

33 *crowd who sat round him, said to him, Lo, thy mother and thy brothers are without, and seek*

34 *thee. He answered them saying, Who is my mother or my brothers? And looking about*

Mat. 9; 34.
& 12; 24.
Lu. 11; 15.

Mat. 12; 31.
Lu. 12; 10.
1 Jo. 15; 46.

Mat. 12; 46.
Lu. 8; 19.

CH. 4.

SECT. II.

on those who sat around him, he said, Behold
 35 *my mother and my brothers ; for whosoever*
doth the will of God, is my brother, my sister,
and mother.

Mat. 13 ; 1.

IV. *Again, he was teaching by the sea-side, when*
so great a multitude gathered about him, that
he was obliged to go aboard a bark and sit
there, while all the people remained on shore.

2 *Then he taught them many things by parables.*

Mat. 13 ; 4.
Lu. 8 ; 4.

3 *In teaching, he said to them, Attend, behold*
 4 *the sower went out to sow. And as he sowed,*
part of the seed fell by the way-side, and the
 5 *birds came and picked it up ; part fell upon*
rocky ground, where it had little mould. This
sprang the sooner, because there was no depth
 6 *of soil. But after the sun had beaten upon it,*
it was scorched, and having no root, it wither-
 7 *ed away. Part fell amidst thorns ; and the*
thorns grew up and stifled it, so that it yielded
 8 *nothing. Part fell into good ground, and*
sprang up, and became so fruitful, that some
grains produced thirty, some sixty, and some a
 9 *hundred. He added, Whoever hath ears to*
hear, let him hear.

Mat. 13 ; 10.
Lu. 8 ; 9.

10 *When he was in private, those who were about*
him with the twelve asked him the meaning of
 11 *the parable. He said to them, It is your privi-*
lege to know the secrets of the reign of God,
but to those without every thing is veiled in
 12 *parables ; that they may not perceive what*
they look at. or understand what they hear ;
lest they should be reclaimed, and obtain the
 13 *forgiveness of their sins. He said also to them,*

Is. 6 ; 9.

SECT. II.

CH. 4.

Do ye not understand this parable? How then will ye understand all [my] parables?

- 14 The sower is he who disperseth the word. Mat. 13; 18.
Lu. 8; 11.
- 15 The wayside on which some of the grain fell, denoteth those who have no sooner heard the word, than Satan cometh and taketh away that
- 16 which was sown in their hearts. The rocky ground denoteth those who hearing the word,
- 17 receive it at first with pleasure; yet not having it rooted in their minds, retain it but a while; for when trouble or persecution cometh because of the word, they instantly relapse.
- 18 The ground over-run with thorns, denoteth
- 19 those hearers in whom worldly cares, and delusive riches, and the inordinate desires of other things, stifle the word and render it un-
- 20 fruitful. The good soil on which some grains yielded thirty, some sixty, and some a hundred, denoteth those who hear the word and retain it, and produce the fruits thereof.
- 21 *He said further,* Is a lamp brought to be put under a corn-measure, or under a bed; and
- 22 not to be set on a stand? For there is no secret that is not to be discovered; nor hath aught been concealed which was not to be
- 23 divulged. If any man have ears to hear let him hear.
- 24 *He said moreover,* Consider what ye hear: with the measure wherewith ye give, ye shall receive; and to you who are attentive, more
- 25 shall be added. For to him who hath, more shall be given; but from him who hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken.
- 26 *He said also,* The kingdom of God is like

Mat. 5; 15.
Lu. 8; 16.
& 11; 33.

Mat. 10; 26.

Lu. 8; 18.
Mat. 7; 2.
Lu. 6; 38.
Mat. 13; 12.
& 25; 29.
Lu. 19; 26.

CH. 4.

SECT. II.

27 seed which a man sowed in his field. While
 he slept by night and waked by day, the seed
 28 shot up, and grew without his minding it. For
 the earth produceth of itself first the blade,
 29 then the ear; afterwards the full corn. But as
 soon as the grain was ripe, he applied the
 sickle, because it was time to reap it.

Mat. 13; 31. 30 *He said also, Whereunto shall we compare
 the kingdom of God, or by what similitude
 31 shall we represent it? It is like a grain of mus-
 tard-seed, which, when it is sown in the earth,
 is the smallest of all the seeds that are there.
 32 But after it is sown, it springeth up, and be-
 cometh greater than any herb, and shooteth
 out branches so large, that under their shades
 the birds of the air may find shelter.*

33 *And in many such similitudes he conveyed
 instruction to the people, as he found them dis-
 34 posed to hear: and without a similitude he told
 them nothing; but he solved all to his disciples
 in private.*

Mat. 1; 23. Lu. 8; 22. 35 *That day, in the evening, he said to them,
 36 Let us pass to the other side. And they leav-
 ing the people, but having him in the bark, [set
 37 sail] in company with other small barks. Then
 there arose a great storm of wind, which drove
 the billows into the bark, which was now full.
 38 Jesus being in the stern, asleep on a pillow,
 they awaken him, saying, Rabbi, carest thou
 39 not that we perish? And he arose and com-
 manded the wind, saying to the sea, Peace!
 be still! Immediately the wind ceased, and a
 40 great calm ensued. And he said to them, Why*

SECT. II.

CH. 5.

are ye so timorous? How is it that ye have no
 41 faith? *And they were exceedingly terrified, and
 said one to another, Who is this whom even the*
 V. *wind and the sea obey? Then they crossed the* Mat. 8; 28.
Lu. 8; 26.
sea and came into the country of the Gadarenes.

2 *He was no sooner gone ashore, than there met
 him a man coming from the monuments, possess-*
 3 *ed of an unclean spirit, who made his abode in
 the tombs; and no man could confine him, not*
 4 *even with chains. For he had been often bound
 with fetters and chains, and had wrenched off*
 5 *the chains, and broken the fetters, so that no-*
 6 *body was able to tame him. He was continual-*
 7 *ly, night and day, in the mountains, and in the*
 8 *tombs, howling, and cutting himself with flints.*
 9 *But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran, and*
 10 *prostrating himself before him, cried out, What*
 11 *hast thou to do with me, Jesus, Son of the most*
 12 *high God, I conjure thee by God not to tor-*
 13 *ment me. (For Jesus had said to him, Come*
 14 *out of the man, thou unclean spirit.) Jesus*
 15 *asked him, What is thy name? He answered,*
 16 *My name is legion¹⁶, for we are many. And*
 17 *he earnestly entreated him not to drive them out*
 18 *of the country. Now there was a great herd of*
 19 *swine feeding on the mountain. And all the*
 20 *fiends besought him, saying, Suffer us to go to*
 21 *the swine, that we may enter into them. Jesus*
 22 *immediately permitted them. Then the unclean*
 23 *spirits being gone out, entered into the swine;*

¹⁶ About 6000.

and the herd, in number about two thousand, rushed down a precipice into the sea, and were
 14 choked. And the swine-herds fled, and told it in the city and villages. And the people flock-
 15 ed out to see what had happened. When they came to Jesus, and saw him who had been possessed by the legion, sitting and clothed, and in
 16 his right mind, they were afraid. And those who had seen the whole, having related to them what had happened to the demoniac, and to the
 17 swine; they entreated him to leave their territories.
 18 As he entered the bark, the man who had been possessed, begged permission to attend
 19 him. Jesus, however, did not permit him, but said, Go home to thy relations, and tell them what great things the Lord in pity hath done
 20 for thee. Accordingly he departed, publishing in Decapolis¹⁷, what great things Jesus had done for him. And all were amazed.

Mat. 9; 18.
 Lu. 8; 41.

21 Jesus having repassed in the bark, a great crowd gathered round him while he was on the
 22 shore. Then came one of the directors of the synagogue, named Jairus, who seeing him, threw
 23 himself at his feet, and entreated him earnestly, saying, My little daughter is in extreme danger; I pray thee come and lay thy hands upon
 24 her to recover her, and she will be well. And Jesus went with him, followed by a great multitude who thronged him.

Mar. 9; 19.
 Lu. 8; 43.

25 And a woman who had been twelve years distressed with an issue of blood, who had suffered

¹⁷ A district of ten cities.

SECT. II.

CH. 5.

26 *much from several physicians, and had spent*
her all without receiving any relief, but rather
 27 *growing worse, having heard of Jesus, came in*
 28 *the crowd behind, and touched his mantle; for*
she had said, 'If I but touch his clothes, I shall
 29 *'recover.'* *Instantly the source of her distemper*
was dried up, and she felt in her body that she
 30 *was delivered from that scourge. Jesus imme-*
diately, conscious of the virtue which had is-
sued from him, turned towards the crowd, say-
 31 *ing, Who touched my clothes? His disciples*
answered, Thou seest how the multitude
throng thee; yet thou sayest, 'Who touched
 32 *'me?'* *But he looked round him to see her who*
 33 *had done it. Then the woman, knowing the*
change wrought upon her, came trembling with
fear, threw herself prostrate before him, and
 34 *confessed the whole truth. But he said to her,* Lu. 7; 50.
Daughter, thy faith hath cured thee; go in
peace, released from this scourge.

35 *Ere he had done speaking, messengers came* Lu. 8; 49
from the house of the director of the synagogue,
who said, Thy daughter is dead, why shouldst
 36 *thou trouble the teacher any further? Jesus*
hearing this message delivered, said immediate-
 37 *ly to the director, Fear not; only believe. And*
he allowed nobody to follow him except Peter
and James, and John the brother of James.

38 *Being arrived at the director's house, and see-* Mat. 9; 23
 39 *ing the tumult, and the people weeping and wail-*
ing immoderately, he said to them, as he en-
tered, Why do ye weep, and make a bustle?
 40 *the child is not dead but asleep. And they*

derided him. *But having made them all go out, he took with him the child's father and mother, and those who came with him; and he entered*
 41 *the chamber where she was lying, and, taking her by the hand, said to her, Talitha cumi, (which signifieth, 'Damsel arise,')* I command
 42 *thee. Immediately the damsel arose and walked, for she was twelve years old; and they were*
 43 *confounded with astonishment. But he strictly enjoined them not to mention it to any body, and ordered that something should be given her to eat.*

Nov 15 1836

SECTION III.

THE FIRST MISSION OF THE APOSTLES.

Mat. 13; 54.
 Lu. 4; 16.

VI. *JESUS leaving that place, went to his own*
 2 *country, accompanied by his disciples. And on the Sabbath he taught in their synagogues, and many who heard him said with astonishment, Whence hath this man these abilities? what wisdom is this which he hath gotten? and how*
 3 *are so great miracles performed by him? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joses, and Judas and Simon? Are not his sisters also here with us?*
 4 *And they were scandalized at him. But Jesus said to them, A prophet is nowhere disregarded, except in his own country, and amongst his*
 5 *own relations, and in his own house. And he*

Jo. 6; 42.

Jo. 4; 44.

CH. 6.

SECT. III.

could do no miracle there, except curing a few
6 sick by laying his hands on them. And he
wondered at their unbelief.

And he went through the neighbouring vil-
7 lages teaching. And having called to him the
twelve, he sent them out two by two, and gave
8 them power over the unclean spirits; and or-
dered them to take nothing for their journey but
a single staff, no bag, no bread, and in their
9 girdle no money; to be shod with sandals, Acts, 12; 3.
10 and not to put on two coats. He said also,
Whatever house ye enter in any place, continue
11 in that house until ye leave the place. But
wheresoever they will not receive you, nor
hear you, shake off the dust under your feet at
your departure as a protestation against them. Acts, 13; 51.
Verily I say unto you, the condition of Sodom
and Gomorra shall be more tolerable on the
day of judgment than the condition of that
12 city. And being departed, they publicly warn-
13 ed men to reform; and expelled many demons,
and cured many sick persons, anointing them
with oil.

14 And king Herod heard of him (for his name
was become famous) and said, John the bap-
tizer is raised from the dead; and therefore
15 miracles are performed by him. Others said, It
is Elijah. Others, It is a prophet like those of
16 ancient times. But when Herod heard of him,
he said, This is John whom I beheaded. He
is raised from the dead.

17 For Herod had caused John to be apprehend-
ed, and kept bound in prison, on account of
Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, whom he
Mat. 14; 3;
Lu. 9; 7;
Mat. 14; 3;
Lu. 3; 19;

CH. 6.

SECT. III.

Lev. 18 ; 16.
& 20 ; 21.

18 *had himself married. For John had said to Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy*
 19 *brother's wife. Now this roused Herodias' re-*
 20 *sentment, who would have killed John, but could not, because Herod respected him, and knowing him to be a just and holy man, protected him, and did many things recommended by him, and*
 21 *heard him with pleasure. At length a favourable opportunity offered, which was Herod's birth-day, when he made an entertainment for the great officers of his court and army, and the*
 22 *persons of distinction in Galilee. For the daughter of Herodias came in and danced before them, and pleased Herod and his guests so much, that the king said to the damsel, Ask whatever thou wilt and I will give it thee ;*
 23 *nay, he swore to her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask, I will give thee, were it the half of my king-*
 24 *dom. And she withdrew and said to her mother, What shall I ask ? She answered, The head*
 25 *of John the Baptist. Her daughter then, returning hastily to the king, made this request : I would that thou give me presently in a basin*
 26 *the head of John the Baptist. And the king was much grieved ; however, from a regard to his oath, and his guests, he would not refuse*
 27 *her, but immediately dispatched a sentinel with*
 28 *orders to bring the Baptist's head. Accordingly he went and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head in a basin, and presented it to the damsel ; and the damsel presented it to her*
 29 *mother. When his disciples heard this, they went and fetched his corpse, and laid it in a monument.*

SECT. III.

CH. 6.

- 30 *NOW* the Apostles being assembled, related every thing to Jesus, both what they had done,
 31 and what they had taught. And he said to them, Come ye apart into a desert place, and rest awhile; for there were so many coming and going, that they had not leisure so much as
 32 to eat. And they retired by ship to a desert Jo. 6; 1.
 33 place to be by themselves. But many who saw them depart, and knew whither they were sailing, ran out of all the cities, and got thither by land before them, and came together to him.
 34 Jesus being landed saw a great multitude, and had compassion on them; because they were as a flock which hath no shepherd; and he taught them many things. Mat. 9; 36.
- 35 When it grew late, his disciples came to him and said, This is a desert place, and it is now Mat. 14; 15.
Lu. 9; 12.
Jo. 6; 5.
 36 late; dismiss the people that they may go to the neighbouring farms and villages, and buy themselves bread, for they have nothing to eat.
 37 He answering, said unto them, Supply them yourselves. They replied, Shall we go and give two hundred denarii¹⁸ for bread, in order
 38 to supply them? He said to them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. Upon inquiry
 39 they answered, Five, and two fishes. And he commanded them to make all the people lie down upon the green grass in separate compa-
 40 nies. And they formed themselves into squares,
 41 by hundreds and by fifties. Then Jesus taking the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking

¹⁸ About 6l. 5s. sterling.

up to heaven, blessed and broke the loaves, and gave them to his disciples to set before the multitude. He distributed also the two fishes
 42 among them all. When they all had eaten and
 43 were satisfied, they carried off twelve baskets full of the fragments of the bread and of the
 44 fishes. Now they who ate of the loaves were five thousand men.

Mat. 14; 22.
 Jo. 6; 16.

45 And immediately he obliged his disciples to embark, and pass over before towards Bethsaida, while he dismissed the people. And having sent them away, he retired to a mountain to
 46 pray. In the evening, the bark being in the
 47 midst of the sea, and he alone on the land, he observed them toiling at the oar, for the wind was against them: and about the fourth watch of the night¹⁹, he went to them, walking upon the water, and seemed intending to pass by them.
 49 When they saw him walking upon the sea, they thought it was an apparition, and cried out.
 50 For they all saw him, and were terrified; but he immediately spake to them, saying, Take
 51 courage, it is I, be not afraid. And having gone aboard to them, the wind ceased, which struck them still more with astonishment and
 52 admiration: for their minds were so stupified, that they never reflected upon the loaves.

Mat. 14; 34.

53 When they had crossed, they came to the territory of Genesaret²⁰, where they landed. And being come ashore, the people knew him, and

¹⁹ Between three and six in the morning.

²⁰ In the Old Testament *Chinnereth*.

SECT. IV.

CH. 7.

55 *ran through all that country, carrying the sick
on couches to every place where they heard he
56 was. And whatever village, or city, or town he
entered, they laid the diseased in the streets,
and besought him that they might touch, were it
but a tuft of his mantle ; and whosoever touch-
ed him were healed.*

Nov 13 1853

SECTION IV.

THE ERRORS OF THE PHARISEES.

VII. *NOW the Pharisees, and some Scribes who* Mat. 15; 1.
 2 *came from Jerusalem, resorted to Jesus. When
these observed some of his disciples eating with
impure (that is, unwashen) hands, they found
3 fault. For the Pharisees, and indeed all the
Jews who observe the tradition of the elders,
eat not until they have washed their hands, by
4 pouring a little water upon them ; and if they
be come from the market, by dipping them ;
and many other usages there are which they
have adopted, as baptisms of cups and pots, and
5 brazen vessels and beds. Then the Pharisees
and the Scribes asked him, Whence cometh it,
that thy disciples observe not the tradition of
6 the elders, but eat with unwashen hands ? He
answering, said unto them, O hypocrites, well
do ye suit the character which Isaiah gave of* Is. 29; 13.

CH. 7.

SECT. IV.

you, when he said, "This people honoureth
 "me with their lips; but their heart is es-
 7 "tranged 'from me. In vain, however, they
 "worship me, while they teach institutions
 8 "merely human." For laying aside the com-
 mandment of God, ye retain the traditions of
 men, baptisms of pots and cups, and many
 9 other the like practices. Ye judge well, *con-*
tinued he, in annulling the commandment of
 10 God, to make room for your tradition. For
 Moses hath said, "Honour thy father and thy
 "mother," and, "Whosoever revileth father or
 11 "mother, shall be punished with death." But
 ye maintain, If a man say to father or mother,
 'Be it corban (*that is, 'devoted'*) whatever of
 12 'mine shall profit thee;' he must not thence-
 forth do aught for his father or his mother; thus
 13 invalidating the word of God by the tradition
 which ye have established. And in many
 other instances ye act thus.

Ex. 10; 12.
 Deu. 5; 16.
 Ex. 21; 17.
 Lev. 20; 9.
 Pro. 20; 20.

Mat. 15; 10.

14 *Then having called the whole multitude, he*
said to them, Harken to me all of you, and be
 15 *instructed. There is nothing from without*
which, entering into the man, can pollute him;
but the things which proceed from within the
 16 *man, are the things that pollute him. If any*
man have ears to hear, let him hear.

Mat. 15; 15.

17 *When he had withdrawn from the people into*
a house, his disciples asked him the meaning of
 18 *that sentence. He answered, Are ye also void*
of understanding? Do ye not conceive, that
 19 *whatsoever from without entereth into the*
man, cannot pollute him; because it entereth

SECT. IV.

CH. 7.

not into his heart, but into his belly, whence all impurities in the victuals pass into the sink. 20 But, *added he*, that which proceedeth out of 21 the man, is what polluteth the man: for from within the human heart proceed vicious machinations, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, 22 insatiable desires, malevolence, fraud, immodest, 23 envy, calumny, arrogance, levity. All these evils issue from within, and pollute the man.

24 *Then he arose and went to the frontiers of Tyre and Sidon; and having entered a house, he desired that none might know of him; but he could not be concealed. For a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, hearing of him, came and threw herself at his feet (the woman was a Greek, a native of Syrophenicia,) and entreated him, that he would cast the demon out of her daughter. Jesus answered, Let the children first be satisfied; for it is not seemly to take the children's bread, and throw it to the dogs. She replied, True, Sir, yet even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs. He said to her, For this answer go home; the demon is gone out of thy daughter. Immediately she went home, and found her daughter lying upon the bed, and freed from the demon.* Mat. 15; 21.

31 *Then leaving the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he returned to the sea of Galilee, through the precincts of Decapolis. And they brought to him a deaf man, who had also an impediment in his speech, and entreated him to lay his hand*

CH. 8.

SECT. IV.

33 upon him. *Jesus having taken him aside from the crowd, spat upon his own fingers, and put them into the man's ears, and touched his tongue.*
 34 *Then looking up to heaven, and sighing, he said,*
 35 *Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. Immediately his ears were opened, and his tongue loosed, and*
 36 *he spoke distinctly. Jesus charged them to tell nobody: but the more he charged them, the more they published it, saying, with inexpressible*
 37 *amazement, He doth every thing well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.*

Mat. 15; 32.

VIII. *At that time the crowd being very numerous,*
 2 *and having no food, Jesus called his disciples, and said to them, I have compassion on the multitude; for they have attended me now*
 3 *three days, and have nothing to eat; and if I send them home fasting, their strength will fail by the way; for some of them are come*
 4 *from afar. His disciples answered, Whence can we supply these people with bread here in*
 5 *the desert? He asked them, How many loaves have ye? They said, Seven. Then commanding the multitude to place themselves upon the*
 6 *ground, he took the seven loaves, and having given thanks, broke them, and gave them to his*
 7 *people, and they distributed them. They had also a few small fishes, which, after the blessing,*
 8 *he likewise ordered to be presented. So they ate, and were satisfied; and the fragments which remained were carried off in seven*
 9 *maunds. Now they who had eaten were about four thousand.*

Mat. 16; 1.

10 *Having dismissed them, he immediately em-*

SECT. IV.

CH. 8.

barked with his disciples, and went into the
 11 territory of Dalmanutha. Thence some Phari-
 sees came, who began to argue with him, and, in
 order to prove him, demanded of him a sign in
 12 the sky. Jesus answered, with a deep groan,
 Wherefore doth this generation require a sign?
 Verily I say unto you, that no sign shall be
 13 given to this generation. After that, leaving
 them, he reembarked and returned.

14 Now the disciples had forgotten to bring Mat. 16; 5.
Lu. 12; 1.
 bread, having only one loaf with them in the
 15 bark. Then Jesus gave them this caution: At-
 tend; beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,
 16 and of the leaven of Herod. They reflecting
 17 hereon, said among themselves: It is because
 we have no bread. Jesus remarking it, said
 unto them: Why make ye this reflection, that
 ye have no bread? Are ye yet so thoughtless,
 18 so inattentive? Is your understanding still
 blinded? have you no use of your eyes, or of
 19 your ears? or do ye not remember? When I
 distributed the five loaves among the five
 thousand, how many baskets full of fragments
 did ye carry off? They answered, Twelve.
 20 And when the seven among the four thousand,
 how many maunds full of fragments did ye
 21 carry off? They said, Seven. How then is it,
 proceeded he, that ye do not apprehend me?
 22 When Jesus came to Bethsaida, they brought
 to him a blind man whom they entreated him to
 23 touch. He took the blind man by the hand, and
 led him out of the village. Then having put
 spittle on his eyes, and laid his hands upon him,

CH. 8.

SECT. V.

24 *he asked him, whether he saw. Having looked up, he said, I see men, whom I distinguish*
 25 *from trees only by their walking. And Jesus laid his hands upon the man's eyes, and made*
 26 *him look again. And he was so perfectly cured, as to see every object clearly. And Jesus sent him home, saying, Neither go into the village, nor tell aught to any of the villagers.*

SECTION V.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

Mat. 16; 23.
Lu. 9; 18.

27 *JESUS went thence with his disciples to the vil-*
lages of Cesarea Philippi, and by the way he
 28 *asked them, saying, Who do men say that I am? They answered, 'John the Baptist;' but some*
 29 *say 'Elijah;' and others, 'one of the Prophets.'*
 30 *He said to them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answering, said to him, Thou art the Messiah. Then he charged them to tell nobody this concerning him.*

Mat. 16; 21.
Lu. 9; 22.

31 *And he began to inform them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and that in three days he*
 32 *must rise again. This he spoke so plainly, that*
 33 *Peter taking him aside, reprov'd him. But he turning, and looking on his disciples, rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee hence, adversary, for*

SECT. V.

CH. 9.

thou dost not relish the things of God, but the things of men.

- 34 *Then having called both to the people, and to his disciples, he said, Is any man willing to come under my guidance? Let him renounce himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.* Mat. 16 ; 24.
Lu. 9 ; 23.
Jo. 12 ; 25.
- 35 For whosoever would save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life, for my sake
- 36 and the gospel's, shall save it. What would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world,
- 37 with the forfeit of his life? or what will a man
- 38 not give in ransom for his life? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him likewise the Son of Man will be ashamed, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, accompanied by the holy messengers. *He added, Verily I say unto you, there are some standing here, who shall not taste death, until they see the reign of God ushered in with power.*

Mat. 10 ; 35.
Lu. 12 ; 9.

- 2 *AFTER six days Jesus took Peter, and James and John, apart to the top of a high mountain, and was transfigured in their presence. His garments became glittering, and were, like snow, of such a whiteness, as no fuller on the earth could imitate. There appeared to them also Elijah and Moses, who were conversing with Jesus. Then Peter said to Jesus, Rabbi, it is good for us to stay here: let us make three booths, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah: for he knew not what he said, they were so terrified. And there came a cloud* Mat. 17 ; 1.
Lu. 9 ; 28.
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7

which covered them; and out of the cloud issued a voice, which said, This is my beloved

2 Pet. 1; 17.
ch. 1; 11.
Mat. 3; 17.
Lu. 3; 22.

8 Son, hear him. *And instantly looking about, they saw nobody but Jesus and themselves.*

Mat. 17; 9.

9 *As they went down from the mountain, he charged them not to relate to any body what they had seen, until the Son of man were risen*
10 *from the dead. And they took notice of that expression, and inquired among themselves what*
11 *the rising from the dead could mean. Then they asked him, saying, Why do the Scribes*
12 *affirm, that Elijah must come first? He answered, Elijah, to consummate the whole, must come first, and, (as it is written of the Son of Man) must likewise suffer many things, and be*
13 *contemned. But I tell you, that Elijah too is come, as was predicted, and they have treated him as they pleased.*

Mat. 17; 14.
Lu. 9; 37.

14 *WHEN he returned to the other disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and some*
15 *scribes disputing with them. As soon as the people saw him, they were all struck with awe,*
16 *and ran to salute him. And he asked the scribes, About what do ye dispute with them?*
17 *One of the people answering, said, Rabbi, I have brought thee my son, who hath a dumb*
18 *spirit; and wheresoever it seizeth him, it dasheth him on the ground, where he continueth foaming, and grinding his teeth, till his strength is exhausted. And I spoke to thy disciples to expel the demon, but they were not able.*
19 *Jesus thereupon said, O unbelieving generation; how long shall I be with you? How long shall*

SECT. V.

CH. 9.

- 20 I suffer you? Bring him to me. *Accordingly they brought him : and no sooner did he see him, than the spirit threw him into convulsions ; so that he foamed and rolled upon the ground.*
- 21 *Jesus asked the father, How long is it since*
- 22 *this first befel him? He answered, From his infancy ; and often hath it thrown him both into the fire, and into the water, to destroy him ; but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion upon us, and help us. Jesus replied,*
- 23 *If thou canst believe ; all things are practicable for him who believeth. The boy's father,*
- 24 *crying out immediately, said with tears, I believe ; master, supply thou the defects of my*
- 25 *faith. When Jesus saw that the people came crowding upon him, he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, come out of him, I command thee, and enter*
- 26 *no more into him. Then the demon having cried aloud, and severely convulsed him, came out, and he appeared as one dead, insomuch*
- 27 *that many said, He is dead. But Jesus taking him by the hand, raised him, and he stood up.*
- 28 *When Jesus was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we* Mat. 17 ; 19.
- 29 *expel the demon? He answered, This kind cannot be dislodged unless by prayer and fasting.*
- 30 *Having left that place, they passed through Galilee, and he was desirous that nobody should know it, for he was instructing his disciples.*
- 31 *And he said to them, The Son of Man will soon be delivered into the hands of men, who will kill him ; and after he is killed, he will rise* Mat. 17 ; 12.

CH. 9.

SECT. V.

32 again the third day. *But they understood not what he meant, and were shy to ask him.*

Mat. 18 ; 1.
Lu. 9 ; 46.

33 *When he was come to Capernaum, being in the house, he asked them, What were ye debating amongst yourselves by the way ? But they were silent ; for they had debated among themselves by the way who should be greatest. Then having sat down, he called the twelve, and said to them, If any man would be first, he shall be*
36 *the last of all, and the servant of all. And he took a child, and placed him in the midst of them, and holding him in his arms, said to them,*
37 *Whosoever shall receive one such child on my account, receiveth me ; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him who sent me.*

Lu. 9 ; 49.

38 *Then John said to him, Rabbi, we saw one expelling demons, in thy name, who followeth not us, and we forbade him, because he doth*
39 *not follow us. Jesus answered, Forbid him not ; for there is none who worketh a miracle in my name, that can readily speak evil of me.*
40 *For whoever is not against you is for you.*
41 *For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink on my account, because ye are Christ's ; verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward.*

Mat. 10 ; 42.

42 *But whoever shall insnare any of the little ones who believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were fastened to his neck, and*
43 *that he were thrown into the sea. Moreover, if thy hand insnare thee, cut it off ; it is better for thee to enter maimed into life, than having*

Mat. 18 ; 6.
Lu. 17 ; 1.
Mat. 5 ; 29.
& 18 ; 8.

SECT. V.

CH. 10.

two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire; where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched. And if thy foot insnare thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter lame into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the unquenchable fire, where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched. And if thine eye insnare thee, pull it out; it is better for thee to enter one-eyed into the kingdom of God, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire; where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched: for every one shall be seasoned with fire; as every sacrifice is seasoned with salt. Salt is good; but if the salt become tasteless, wherewith will ye season it? Preserve salt in yourselves, and maintain peace with one another.

Is. 66; 24.
Eccclus. 7; 17
Judith, 16;
17.

Lev. 2; 13.
Mat. 5; 13.
Lu. 14; 34.

X. *Then he arose and came into the confines of Judea, through the country upon the Jordan. Again multitudes resorted to him: and again, as his custom was, he taught them.*

Mat. 19; 1.

2 *And some Pharisees came who, to try him, asked him, Is it lawful for the husband to divorce his wife? He answering, said to them, What precept hath Moses given you on this subject? They replied, Moses hath permitted us to write her a bill of divorcement, and dismiss her. Jesus answering, said to them, Because of your untractable disposition, Moses gave you this permission. But from the beginning, at the creation, God made them a*

Mat. 19; 3.

Deu. 24; 1.

CH. 10.

SECT. 7.

Gen. 1 ; 27.
Eph. 5 ; 31.
Gen. 2 ; 24.

7 male and a female. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall adhere to his wife, and they two shall be one
8 flesh. They are, therefore, no longer two, but
9 one flesh. What God then hath conjoined, let not man separate.

Mat. 5 ; 22.
Lu. 16 ; 18.

10 *And in the house his disciples asked him*
11 *anew concerning this matter. He said to them,*
Whosoever divorceth his wife and marrieth
12 another, committeth adultery against her ; and if a woman divorce her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery.

Mat. 19 ; 13.
Lu. 18 ; 15.

13 *Then they brought children to him, that he might touch them ; but the disciples rebuked*
14 *those who brought them. Jesus perceiving this, was offended, and said,* Allow the children to come unto me, and do not hinder them ; for of

Mat. 18 ; 1.

15 such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child, shall never enter it.
16 *Then taking them up in his arms, and laying his hands upon them, he blessed them.*

Mat. 19 ; 16.
Lu. 18 ; 12.

17 *As he went out into the road, one came running to him, who, kneeling, asked him,* Good teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life ?

Ex. 20 ; 12.
Deut. 5 ; 16.

18 *Jesus answered,* Why callest thou me good ?
19 God alone is good. Thou knowest the commandments : do not commit adultery ; do not commit murder ; do not steal ; do not give false testimony ; do no injury ; honour thy
20 father and mother. *The other replied,* Rabbi, I have observed all these from my childhood.
21 *Jesus, looking upon him, loved him, and said to*

SECT. V.

CH. 10.

him, In one thing, nevertheless, thou art deficient. Go, sell all that thou hast, and give the price to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; then come and follow me, carrying
 22 the cross. *But he was troubled at this answer, and went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions.*

23 *Then Jesus looking around him, said to his disciples, How difficult is it for the wealthy to*
 24 *enter the kingdom of God! The disciples were astonished at his words: but Jesus resuming the discourse, said, Children, how difficult is it for them who confide in wealth, to enter*
 25 *the kingdom of God! It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a*
 26 *rich man to enter the kingdom of God. At this they were still more amazed, and said one*
 27 *to another, Who then can be saved? Jesus looking upon them, said, To men it is impossible, but not to God: for to God all things are possible.*

28 *Then Peter took occasion to say, As for us,*
 29 *we have forsaken all, and followed thee. Jesus answering, said, Verily I say unto you, there is none who shall have forsaken his house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake and the*
 30 *gospel's; who shall not receive now in this world a hundred-fold, houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions, and in the future state eter-*
 31 *nal life. But many shall be first who are last, and last who are first.*

Mat. 19; 23.
Lu. 18; 24.Mat. 19; 27.
Lu. 18; 28.

Lu. 13; 30.

SECTION VI.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

Mat. 20; 17.
Mat. 20; 20.

32 *AS they were on the road to Jerusalem, Jesus walking before them, a panic seized them, and they followed him with terror. Then taking the twelve aside, he told them again what would*
33 *befal him. Behold, sayeth he, we are going to Jerusalem, where the Son of Man shall be delivered to the chief priests, who will condemn him to die, and consign him to the Gentiles ;*
34 *who will mock him, and scourge him, and spit upon him, and kill him ; but the third day he shall rise again.*

Lu. 18 ; 31.

35 *Then James and John, the sons of Zebedee, accosted him, saying, Rabbi, we beg thou*
36 *wouldst grant us what we purpose to ask. He said to them, What would you have me grant*
37 *you ? They answered, That when thou shalt have attained thy glory, one of us may sit at*
38 *thy right hand, and the other at thy left. Jesus replied, Ye know not what ye ask. Can ye drink such a cup as I am to drink ; and under-*
39 *go an immersion like that which I must under-*
40 *go ? They answered, We can. Jesus said to them, Ye shall indeed drink such a cup as I am to drink ; and undergo an immersion like that which I must undergo : but to sit at my right*

SECT. VI.

CH. 10.

hand, and at my left, I cannot give, unless to those for whom it is appointed.

41 *The ten hearing this, conceived indignation* Mat. 20; 20.
 42 *against James and John. But Jesus having called them together, said to them, Ye know that those who are accounted the princes of the nations domineer over them; and their great ones exercise their authority upon them:* Lu. 22; 24.
 43 *but it must not be so amongst you. On the contrary, whosoever would be great amongst*
 44 *you, shall be your servant; and whosoever would be the chief, shall be the slave of all.*
 45 *For even the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.* Phil. 2; 7.

46 *Then they came to Jericho. Afterwards, as he was departing thence, with his disciples, and* Mat. 20; 29.
 47 *a great crowd, blind Bartimeus, son of Timeus, who sat by the way-side begging, hearing that it was Jesus the Nazarene, cried saying, Jesus,* Lu. 18; 35.
 48 *thou Son of David, have pity upon me. Many charged him to be silent, but he cried still the*
 49 *louder, Son of David, have pity upon me. Jesus stopping, ordered them to call him. Accordingly they called the blind man, saying to him,*
 50 *Take courage, arise, he calleth thee. Then throwing down his mantle, he sprang up, and*
 51 *went to Jesus. Jesus addressing him, said, What dost thou wish me to do for thee? Rabboni, answered the blind man, to give me my*
 52 *sight. Jesus said to him, Go; thy faith hath cured thee. Immediately he recovered his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.*

Mat. 21 ; 1.
Lu. 19 ; 29.

XI. *As they approached Jerusalem, being come as far as Bethphage and Bethany, near the mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples,*
 2 *and said to them, Go into the village over against you, and just as ye enter it, ye will find a colt tied, whereon no man ever rode ; loose*
 3 *him, and bring him. And if any body ask you, ' Wherefore do ye this ? ' say, ' The master ' needeth him, ' and he will instantly send him*
 4 *hither. Accordingly they went, and finding the colt tied before a door, where two ways met,*
 5 *they loosed him. Some of the people present said to them, Wherefore loose ye the colt ?*
 6 *They having answered as Jesus had command-*
 7 *ed them, were allowed to take him. Accordingly they brought the colt to Jesus, whereon having*
 8 *laid their mantles, Jesus sat upon him. And many spread their mantles in the way ; others cut down sprays from the trees, and strowed*
 9 *them in the way. And they who went before, and they who followed, shouted, saying, Hosanna²¹ ! blessed be he that cometh in the name*
 10 *of the Lord²². Happy be the approaching reign of our father David. Hosanna²³ in the*
 11 *highest heaven. In this manner Jesus entered Jerusalem and the temple ; where, after surveying every thing around, it being late, he departed with the twelve to Bethany.*

Jo. 12 ; 12.

Ps. 118 ; 25.

Mat. 21 ; 18.

12 *On the morrow, when he left Bethany, he*
 13 *was hungry ; and observing a fig-tree at a*

²¹ Save now I pray.

²² Jehovah.

²³ Save now I pray.

SECT VI.

CH. 11.

- distance, full of leaves, went to look for fruit on it, for the fig-harvest was not yet. And being*
- 14 *come, he found nothing but leaves. Thereupon Jesus said to it, Henceforth let never man eat fruit off thee. And his disciples heard him.*
- 15 *Being returned to Jerusalem, Jesus went into the temple, and drove out them who sold and them who bought in the temple, and overturned the tables of the money-changers, and the stalls*
- 16 *of them who sold doves; and would suffer nobody to carry vessels through the temple. He*
- 17 *also taught them, saying, Is it not written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations?" but ye have made it a den of rob-*
- 18 *bers. And the Scribes and the chief priests hearing this, sought means to destroy him; for they dreaded him, because all the multitude*
- 19 *admired his doctrine. And in the evening he went out of the city.*
- 20 *Next morning, as they returned, they saw that the fig-tree was dried up from the root.*
- 21 *Peter recollecting, said to him, Rabbi, behold the fig-tree which thou hast devoted, already*
- 22 *withered. Jesus answered, Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, Whoever shall say to this mountain, 'Be lifted and thrown into 'the sea,' and shall not in the least doubt, but shall believe that what he saith shall happen; whatever he shall command shall be done for*
- 24 *him: for which reason I assure you, that what things soever ye pray for, if ye believe that ye shall obtain them, they shall be yours.*
- 25 *And when ye pray, forgive, if ye have matter of complaint against any; that your Father,*

Mat. 21; 12.
Jo. 2; 14.
Lu. 19; 45.

Isa. 56; 7.
Jer. 7; 11.

Mat. 21; 20.

Mat. 6; 14.

Mat. 18 ; 35. 26 who is in heaven, may also forgive you your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father, who is in heaven, forgive your trespasses.

Mat. 21 ; 23. Lu. 20 ; 1. 27 *Again, they arrived at Jerusalem, and as he was walking in the temple, the chief priests, the*
 28 *scribes, and the elders, came and said to him,*
 By what authority dost thou these things ? and
 29 who empowered thee to do them ? *Jesus answering, said unto them,* I also have a question to ask ; answer me, and I will tell you by what
 30 authority I do these things. Was the title which John had to baptize, from heaven, or
 31 from men ? answer me. *Then they argued thus among themselves : ‘ If we say, From*
 32 *‘ heaven ; he will reply, Why then did ye not*
 Mat. 14 ; 5. *‘ believe him ? But if we say, From men ; we*
‘ are in danger from the people, who are all
 33 *‘ convinced that John was a Prophet.’ They therefore answering, said to Jesus, We cannot tell. Jesus replied, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.*

Mat. 21 ; 33. Lu. 20 ; 9. XII. *Then addressing them in parables, he said,*
 A man planted a vineyard, and hedged it about, and dug a place for the wine vat, and built a tower, and having farmed it out, went abroad.
 2 The season being come, he sent a servant to the husbandmen, to receive his portion of the
 3 fruits of the vineyard. But they seized him,
 4 beat him, and sent him away empty. Again, he sent to them another servant, whom they wounded in the head with stones, and sent
 5 back with disgrace. Again, he sent another, whom they killed ; and of many more that he

SECT. VII.

CH. 12.

sent, some they beat, and some they killed. At
 6 last, having an only son, whom he loved, he
 sent him also to them ; for he said, ‘ They will
 7 ‘ reverence my son.’ But those husbandmen
 said among themselves, / ‘ This is the heir,
 ‘ come, let us kill him ; and the inheritance
 8 ‘ will be our own.’ Then they laid hold on
 him, and having thrust him out of the vineyard,
 9 killed him. What, therefore, will the propri-
 etor of the vineyard do ? He will come and
 destroy the husbandmen, and give the vine-
 10 yard to others. Have ye not read this pas-
 sage of Scripture : “ A stone which the build-
 ers rejected, is made the head of the corner. Ps. 118 ; 22.
 “ This the Lord ²⁴ hath performed, and we be- Acts, 4 ; 11.
 11 “ hold it with admiration.” *And they would 1 Pet. 2 ; 6.*
 12 “ *fain have seized him, but were afraid of the
 multitude ; for they knew that he spoke the
 parable against them.*

SECTION VII.

THE PROPHECY ON MOUNT OLIVET.

13 *THEN the chief priests, the scribes and the* Mat. 22 ; 15.
elders leaving Jesus, went away, and sent to Lu. 20 ; 20.
him certain Pharisees and Herodians ²⁵, to
 14 *catch him in his words. These coming up, said*
to him, Rabbi, we know that thou art upright,

²⁴ Jehovah.²⁵ Partizans of Herod.

and standest in awe of none ; for thou respectest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God faithfully. Is it lawful to give tribute to Cesar, or not ? Shall we give ? or shall we not give ? *He perceiving their artifice, answered, Why would ye entangle me ? Bring me a denarius, that I may see it. When they had brought it, he asked them, Whose is this image and inscription ? They answered, Cesar's.* *Jesus replied, Render to Cesar that which is Cesar's, and to God that which is God's. And they wondered at him.*

Mat. 22 ; 23.
Lu. 20 ; 27.
Acts, 23 ; 3.
Deu. 25 ; 5.

Then came Sadducees to him, who say that there is no future life, and proposed this question : Rabbi, Moses hath enacted, that if a man's brother die, survived by a wife without children, he shall marry the widow, and raise issue to his brother. Now there were seven brothers. The first took a wife, and dying, left no issue. The second married her, and died ; neither left he any issue ; so did also the third. Thus all the seven married her, and left no issue. Last of all, the woman also died. At the resurrection, therefore, when they are risen, to which of the seven will she belong ; for she hath been wife to them all ? *Jesus answering, said unto them, Is not this the source of your error, your not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God ? For there will be neither marrying, nor giving in marriage, among them who rise from the dead. They will then resemble the heavenly messengers. But as to the dead, that they are raised, have ye not read*

SECT. VII.

CH. 12.

in the book of Moses, how God spoke to him Ex. 3; 6.
 in the bush, saying, "I am the God of Abra-
 ham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of
 27 "Jacob." God is not a God of the dead, but
 of the living. Therefore ye greatly err.

28 *A scribe who had heard them dispute, per-* Mat. 22; 35.
Lu. 10; 25.
Deut. 6; 4.
ceiving the justness of his reply, came to him,
and proposed this question: Which is the chief

29 commandment of all? *Jesus answered,* The
 chief of all the commandments is, "Hearken,
 "Israel, the Lord²⁶ is our God: the Lord²⁷ is
 30 "one;" and, "Thou shalt love the Lord²⁸ thy
 "God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul,
 "and with all thy mind, and with all thy
 "strength." This is the first commandment.

31 The second resembleth it: "Thou shalt love Lev. 19; 18.
 "thy neighbour as thyself." There is no com-

32 mandment greater than these. *The scribe*
replied, Truly, Rabbi, thou hast answered well.
 33 There is one God, and only one; and to love
 him with all the heart, and with all the spirit,
 and with all the soul, and with all the strength;
 and to love one's neighbour as one's self, is
 more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices.

34 *Jesus observing how pertinently he had answer-*
ed, said to him, Thou art not far from the king-
 dom of God. *After that, nobody ventured to*
put questions to him.

35 *As Jesus was teaching in the temple, he asked* Mat. 22; 41.
Lu. 20; 41.
Ps. 110; 1
them, Why do the scribes assert that the Mes-

36 siah must be a son of David? Yet David him-

²⁶ Jehovah.²⁷ Jehovah.²⁸ Jehovah.

self, speaking by the Holy Spirit, saith, "The
 " Lord²⁹ said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand,
 37 " until I make thy foes thy footstool." David
 himself, therefore, calleth him his Lord, how
 then can he be his son? *And the common peo-
 ple heard him with delight.*

Mat. 23; 6.
 Lu. 11; 43.
 & 20; 46.

38 *Further, in teaching, he said to them, Beware*
 of the scribes, who affect to walk in robes, who
 39 love salutations in public places, and the prin-
 cipal seats in the synagogues, and the upper-
 40 most places at entertainments, who devour the
 families of widows, and use long prayers for a
 disguise. These shall undergo the severest
 punishment.

Lu. 21; 1.

41 *And Jesus sitting over against the treasury,*
observed the people throwing money into the
treasury: and many rich persons put in much.
 42 *Then came a poor widow, who threw in two mites,*
 43 *which make a farthing³⁰. Jesus having called*
his disciples, said to them, Verily I say unto
 you, that this poor widow hath given more
 than any of those who have thrown into the
 44 treasury: for they all have contributed out of
 their superfluous store; whereas she hath giv-
 en all the little that she had, her whole living.

Mat. 24; 1.
 Lu. 19; 44.
 & 21; 5.

XIII. *AS he was going out of the temple, one of*
his disciples said to him, Rabbi, look what pro-
digious stones and stately buildings are here!
 2 *Jesus answering, said to him, Thou seest these*

²⁹ Jehovah.

³⁰ Less than an English farthing.

great buildings. They shall all be so razed, that one stone will not be left upon another.

3 *Afterwards, as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately,* Tell us when will this happen? And what will be the sign when all this is to be accomplished? *Jesus answering them, took occasion to say,* Take heed that no man seduce you; 4 for many will assume my character, saying, 'I 5 am the person,' and will seduce many. But when ye hear of wars, and rumours of wars, be not alarmed; for this must happen, but the end is not yet.

Mat. 24; 3.
Lu. 21; 7.

8 For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there will be earthquakes in sundry places, and there will be famines and commotions. These are the prelude of woes. But take heed to yourselves; for they will deliver you to councils; and ye will be beaten in the synagogues, and brought before governors and kings for my sake, to 9 bear testimony to them. The good tidings, however, must first be published amongst all 10 nations. But when they conduct you, to deliver you up, have no anxiety beforehand, nor premeditate what ye shall speak; but whatever shall be suggested to you in that moment, speak; for it is not ye that shall speak, but the 11 Holy Spirit. Then the brother will deliver up the brother to death; and the father the child; and children will arise against their parents, and 12 procure their death. And on my account ye

Mat. 24; 7.
Lu. 21; 10.
Mat. 10; 17.
Jo. 16; 2.

Lu. 12; 11.

shall be hated universally ; but the man who persevereth to the end shall be saved.

Mat. 24 ; 15.
Lu. 21 ; 20.
Dan. 9 ; 26.

14 But when ye shall see, in an unsuitable place, the desolating abomination foretold by the Prophet Daniel, (*Reader attend!*) then let those
15 in Judea flee to the mountains ; and let not him who shall be on the roof, go down into the house, nor enter it, to carry any thing out of
16 his house ; and let not him who shall be in the
17 field, turn back to fetch his mantle. But woe to the women with child, and to them who give
18 suck in those days. Pray, then, that your
19 flight happen not in the winter ; because there shall be such affliction, in those days, as hath not been before, from the beginning of the world which God created, nor shall be ever
20 after. Had the Lord assigned it a long duration, no soul could escape ; but for the sake of the people whom he hath elected, he hath made its duration the shorter.

Mat. 24 ; 23.
Lu. 17 ; 23.
& 21 ; 8.

21 Then if any one shall say to you, ‘ Lo ! the ‘ Messiah is here,’ or, ‘ Lo ! he is yonder,’ be-
22 lieve it not. For false messiahs and false prophets will arise, who will perform wonders and prodigies, in order to impose, if possible, even
23 on the elect. Be ye therefore upon your guard : remember, I have warned you of every thing.

Mat. 24 ; 29.
Lu. 21 ; 25.
Is. 13 ; 10.
Ezek. 32 ; 7.
Joel. 2 ; 10.
31. & 3 ; 15.
Rev. 1 ; 7.

24 But in those days, after that affliction, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall withhold her light ; and the stars of heaven
25 shall fall ; and the powers which are in heaven
26 shall be shaken. Then they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power

SECT. VII.

CH. 13.

- 27 and glory. Then he will send his messengers, and assemble his elect from the four quarters of the world, from the extremities of heaven and earth.
- 28 Learn now a similitude from the fig-tree. Mat. 24; 32. Lu. 21; 29. When its branches become tender, and put
- 29 forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh. In like manner, when ye shall see these things happen, know that he is near, even at the door.
- 30 Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass until all these things be accomplished.
- 31 For heaven and earth shall fail: but my words shall not fail.
- 32 But of that day, or of that hour knoweth Mat. 24; 42. none (not the heavenly messengers, no not the
- 33 Son) but the Father. Be circumspect, be vigilant, and pray; for ye know not when that
- 34 time will be. When a man intendeth to travel, he leaveth his household in charge to his servants, assigneth to every one his task, and order-
- 35 eth the porter to watch. Watch ye therefore; for ye know not when the master of the house will return, whether in the evening³¹, or at midnight³², or at cockcrowing³³, or in the
- 36 morning³⁴, lest coming suddenly, he find you
- 37 asleep. Now, what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.

³¹ Nine afternoon.³² Twelve.³³ Three in the morning.³⁴ Six.

SECTION VIII.

THE LAST SUPPER.

Mat. 26 ; 1.
Lu. 22 ; 1.
Jo. 11 ; 47,
53.

XIV. *AFTER* two days was the feast of the pass-over and of unleavened bread. And the chief priests and the scribes were contriving how they might take Jesus by surprize, and kill him.

2 They said, however, Not during the festival, for fear of an insurrection among the people.

Mat. 26 ; 6.
Jo. 11 ; 2.
& 12 ; 2.

3 Now being at table in Bethany, in the house of Simon [formerly] a leper, there came a woman who had an alabaster box of the balsam of spikenard, which was very costly : and she broke open the box, and poured the liquor upon

4 his head. There were some present who said, with secret indignation, Why this profusion of

5 the balsam ? For it could have been sold for more than three hundred denarii³⁵, which might have been given to the poor. And they

6 murmured against her. But Jesus said, Let her alone. Why do ye molest her ? She hath

Deu. 15 ; 11.

7 done me a good office. For ye will have the poor always amongst you, and can do them good whenever ye please ; but me ye will not

8 always have. She hath done what she could.

She hath beforehand embalmed my body for
9 the funeral. Verily I say unto you, in what-

³⁵ Upwards of 9l. sterling.

soever corner of the world the gospel shall be preached, what this woman hath now done shall be mentioned to her honour.

- 10 *Then Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, repaired to the chief priests, to betray Jesus to* Mat. 26; 14.
Lu. 22; 3.
- 11 *them. And they listened to him with joy, and promised to give him money. Afterwards he sought a favourable opportunity to deliver him up.*
- 12 *Now the first day of unleavened bread, when the passover is sacrificed, his disciples said to him, Whither shall we go to prepare for thy* Mat. 26; 17.
Lu. 22; 7.
- 13 *eating the passover? Then he sent two of his disciples, saying to them, Go into the city, where ye will meet a man carrying a pitcher*
- 14 *of water, follow him; and wherever he shall enter, say to the master of the house, 'The*
- 15 *'teacher saith, Where is the guest-chamber, in which I may eat the passover with my disci-*
- 16 *ples?' And he will show you a large upper room ready furnished, there prepare for us.*
- 17 *Accordingly his disciples went away, and being come into the city, found every thing as he had told them, and prepared the passover.*
- 18 *In the evening he went thither with the twelve.* Mat. 26; 20.
Lu. 22; 21.
Jo. 13; 21.
- 19 *As they were at table eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you who eateth*
- 20 *with me, will betray me. Upon this they became very sorrowful, and asked him, all of*
- 21 *them, one after another, Is it I? He answering, said to them, It is one of the twelve, he who dippeth his morsel in the dish with me. The Son of Man departeth in the manner foretold* Ps. 41; 9.

in Scripture concerning him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed: it had been better for that man never to have been born.

Mat. 26 ; 26.
Lu. 22 ; 14.
1 Co. 11 ; 23.

22 *While they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and after the blessing, broke it, and gave it to*
23 *them, saying, Take, eat, this is my body. Then he took the cup, and having given thanks, gave*
24 *it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said to them, This is my blood, the blood of*
25 *the new covenant, shed for many. Verily I say unto you, that I will drink no more of the product of the vine, until that day when I shall*
26 *drink it new in the kingdom of God. And after the hymn they went out to the mount of Olives.*

Mat. 26 ; 31.
Jo. 16 ; 32.
Zech. 13 ; 7.
ch. 16 ; 7.

27 *And Jesus said to them, This night I shall prove a stumblingstone to you all; for it is written, "I will smite the shepherd; and the*
28 *"sheep shall be dispersed." Nevertheless, after I am raised again, I will go before you to*
29 *Galilee. Peter then said to him, Though they all should stumble, I never will. Jesus answered him, Verily I say unto thee, that to-day,*
30 *this very night, before the cock crow twice,*
31 *even thou wilt disown me thrice. But Peter insisted on it, adding, Although I should die with thee, I never will disown thee. And all the rest said the same.*

Mat. 26 ; 36.
Lu. 22 ; 40.

32 *Then they came to a place named Gethsemane where he said to his disciples, Stay here*
33 *while I pray. And he took with him Peter, and James, and John, and being seized with grief*
34 *and horror, said to them, My soul is over-*

whelmed with a deadly anguish; tarry here
 35 and watch. *And going a little before, he threw
 himself on the ground, and prayed that, if
 it were possible, he might be delivered from that*
 36 *hour, and said, Abba (that is, Father,) all things
 are possible to thee; take this cup away from
 me; yet not what I would, but what thou wilt.*
 37 *Then he returned, and finding them asleep, said
 to Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst thou*
 38 *not keep awake a single hour? Watch and
 pray that ye be not overcome by temptation:
 the spirit is indeed willing, but the flesh is*
 39 *weak. Again, he retired and prayed, using the
 same words. When he returned, he again*
 40 *found them sleeping; for their eyes were over-
 powered, and they knew not what to answer*
 41 *him. A third time he came and said to them,
 Sleep on now, and take your rest: all is over:
 the hour is come: and the Son of Man is con-
 signed to the hands of sinners. Arise. Let us*
 42 *be going. Lo! he who betrayeth me is draw-
 ing near.*

43 *Immediately, ere he had done speaking, ap-
 peared Judas, one of the twelve, with a great
 multitude armed with swords and clubs, who
 were sent by the chief priests, the scribes, and*
 44 *the elders. Now the betrayer had given them
 this signal: The man whom I shall kiss is he;
 45 seize him, and lead him away safely. He was
 no sooner come, than accosting Jesus, he said*
 46 *Rabbi, Rabbi, and kissed him. Then they laid
 47 hands on him, and seized him. But one of
 those who were present drew his sword, and*

Mat. 26; 47.
 Lk. 22; 47.
 Jo. 18; 3.

- smiting the high priest's servant, cut off his ear.*
- 48 *Then Jesus addressing them, said, Do ye come with swords and clubs to apprehend me, like*
- 49 *people in pursuit of a robber? I was daily amongst you, teaching in the temple, and ye did not arrest me. But hereby the Scriptures*
- 50 *are accomplished. Then they all forsook him and fled.*
- 51 *Now there followed him a youth who had only a linen cloth wrapped about his body; the*
- 52 *soldiers having laid hold of him, he left the cloth, and fled from them naked.*

SECTION IX.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

- Mat. 26; 57. 53 *THEN they took Jesus away to the high priest,*
Lu. 22; 54.
Jo. 18; 13.
24.
- 54 *with whom all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes were convened. And Peter followed him at a distance, as far as the court of the high priest's house, and sat there with the officers, warming himself at the fire.*
- Mat. 26; 59. 55 *Meanwhile the chief priests and all the Sanhedrim sought for evidence against Jesus, in*
Lu. 22; 66.
- 56 *order to condemn him to die, but found none: for many gave false testimony against him, but their*
- Jo. 2; 19. 57 *testimonies were insufficient. Then some arose*
- 58 *who testified falsely against him, saying, We heard him say, 'I will demolish this temple ' made with hands, and in three days will build*

SECT. IX.

CH. 14.

59 'another without hands.' *But even here their*
 60 *testimony was defective. Then the high priest,*
standing up in the midst, interrogated Jesus,
saying, Dost thou answer nothing to what
 61 *these men testify against thee? But he was si-*
lent, and gave no answer. Again, the high
priest interrogating him, said, Art thou the
 62 *Messiah, the Son of the blessed one? Jesus*
answered, I am; nay, ye shall see the Son of
Man sitting at the right hand of the Almighty,
 63 *and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the*
 64 *high priest rent his garments, saying, What*
further need have we of witnesses? Ye have
heard the blasphemy. What is your opinion?
And they all pronounced him worthy of death.
 65 *Then some began to spit on him; others to*
cover his face and buffet him, saying to him,
Divine who it is. And the officers gave him
blows on the cheeks.

66 *Now Peter being below in the court, one of*
the maid-servants of the high priest came thith-
 67 *er, who seeing Peter warming himself, looked*
on him, and said, Thou also wast with the
 68 *Nazarene Jesus. But he denied, saying, I*
know him not: nor do I understand what thou
meanest. Immediately he went out into the
 69 *portico, and the cock crew. The maid seeing*
him again, said to the standers-by, This is one
 70 *of them. Again he denied. And a little after,*
those who were present said to Peter, Thou art
certainly one of them; for thou art a Galilean,
 71 *thy speech showeth it. Upon this he affirmed,*
with imprecations and oaths, that he did not
 72 *know the man of whom they spake. Then the*

Mat. 26; 69.
 Lu. 22; 55.
 Jo. 18; 17.
 & 25.

ch. 14 ; 30.

*cock crew the second time : and Peter recollect-
ed the word which Jesus had said to him, " Be-
fore the cock crow twice, thou wilt disown me
" thrice." And reflecting thereon, he wept.*

Mat. 27 ; 1.
Lu. 23 ; 1.
Jo. 18 ; 28.

XV. *EARLY in the morning, the chief priests,
with the elders, the scribes, and all the sanhe-
drim, after consulting together, bound Jesus,
carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate.*

Mat. 27 ; 11.
Lu. 23 ; 3.

2 *Pilate asking him, said, Thou art the king of
the Jews ? He answered, Thou sayest right.*

3 *Now the chief priests accused him of many*

4 *things. Again Pilate asked him, saying, An-*

5 *swerest thou nothing ? Observe how many*

6 *crimes they arraign thee for. But Jesus an-*

7 *swered no more, insomuch that Pilate was
astonished.*

Mat. 27 ; 15.
Lu. 23 ; 17.
Jo. 18 ; 39.

8 *Now at the festival, he always released to*

9 *them any one prisoner whom they desired. And*

10 *there was one Barabbas that had been imprison-*

11 *ed with his seditious associates, who in their se-*

12 *dition had committed murder. And with clamour*

13 *the multitude demanded of Pilate what he used*

14 *to grant them. He answered them, saying, Shall*

15 *I release to you the king of the Jews ? (For he*

16 *knew that through envy the chief priests had de-*

17 *livered him up.) But the chief priests incited*

18 *the multitude to insist on the release of Barab-*

19 *bas, in preference to Jesus. Pilate again inter-*

20 *posed, saying, What then would ye have me do*

21 *with him whom ye call king of the Jews ? They*

22 *cried, Crucify him. Pilate asked them, Why ?*

23 *What evil hath he done ? But they cried the*

SECT. IX.

CH. 15.

- 15 *more vehemently, Crucify him. Then Pilate, desirous to gratify the crowd, released Barabbas to them, and having caused Jesus to be scourged, delivered him up to be crucified.*
- 16 *And the soldiers brought him into the hall* Mat. 27; 27.
Jo. 19; 1. *called pretorium³⁶, where having convened all*
- 17 *the band, they arrayed him in purple, and*
- 18 *crowned him with a wreath of thorns, and sa-*
- 19 *luted him, saying, Hail, king of the Jews! Then they struck him on the head with a reed, and spat upon him, and paid him homage on their*
- 20 *knees. And when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the purple, and dressed him in his own clothes, and took him away to be crucified.*
- 21 *And they constrained one Simon a Cyrenian,* Mat. 27; 32.
Lu. 23; 26,
& 33.
Jo. 19; 17. *who passed by, in coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to carry the*
- 22 *cross. And they brought him to Golgotha, that*
- 23 *is to say, the place of skulls, where they gave him wine to drink, mingled with myrrh, which*
- 24 *he would not receive. When they had nailed* Jo. 19; 23. *him to the cross, they parted his garments, dividing by lot what every man should take. Now it was the third hour³⁷ when they nailed him to*
- 26 *the cross. And the inscription, bearing the cause of his death, was in these words, THE*
- 27 *KING OF THE JEWS. They likewise crucified two robbers with him, one at his right*
- 28 *hand, the other at his left. And that Scripture*

³⁶ *The governor's palace, or hall of audience.*

³⁷ *Nine in the morning.*

OH. 15.

SECT. IX.

Is. 53 ; 12.

*was fulfilled, which saith, " he was ranked
" among malefactors."*

Mat. 27 ; 39.
Lu. 23 ; 35.

29 *Meantime they who passed by reviled him,
shaking their heads, and saying, Ah ! thou who
demolishest the temple, and rebuildest it in
30 three days ; save thyself, and come down from
31 the cross. The chief priests likewise, with the
scribes, deriding him, said among themselves,
32 He saved others ; cannot he save himself ? Let
the Messiah, the king of Israel, descend now
from the cross, that we may see and believe.
Even those who were crucified with him, re-
proached him.*

Mat. 27 ; 45.
Lu. 23 ; 44.
Ps. 22 ; 1.

33 *Now from the sixth hour³⁸ until the ninth³⁹,
34 darkness covered all the land. At the ninth
hour⁴⁰, Jesus cried aloud, saying, Eloi, eloi, lam-
ma sabachthani ? which signifieth, " My God,
35 " my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?" Some
who were present, hearing this, said, Hark ! he
36 calleth Elijah. One at the same time ran and
dipped a sponge in vinegar, and having fasten-
ed it to a stick, presented it to him to drink,
saying, let alone, we shall see whether Elijah
37 will come to take him down. And Jesus send-
ing forth a loud cry, expired.*

Mat. 27 ; 51.
Lu. 23 ; 45.

38 *Then was the veil of the temple rent in two,
39 from top to bottom. And the centurion who
stood over against him, observing that he expired*

³⁸ Twelve noon.³⁹ Three afternoon.⁴⁰ Three afternoon.

SECT. X.

CH. 15.

with so loud a cry, said, Surely this man was the Son of a God.

- 40 *There were women also looking on at a distance, amongst whom were Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the younger,*
 41 *and of Joses and Salome (these had followed him, and served him, when he was in Galilee,) and several others who came with him to Jerusalem.*

Mat. 27 ; 55.
 Lu. 23 ; 55.
 Lu. 8 ; 2.

SECTION X.

THE RESURRECTION.

- 42 *WHEN it was evening (because it was the preparation⁴¹, that is, the eve of the Sabbath⁴²),*
 43 *Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable senator, who himself also expected the reign of God, taking courage, repaired to Pilate, and begged*
 44 *the body of Jesus. Pilate, amazed that he was so soon dead, sent for the centurion, and asked him whether Jesus had been dead any time.*
 45 *And being informed by the centurion, he granted the body to Joseph ; who having bought linen, and taken Jesus down, wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a monument, hewn out of the rock, and rolled a stone to the entrance.*
 47 *Now Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of Joses saw where he was laid.*

Mat. 27 ; 57.
 Lu. 23 ; 50.
 Jo. 19 ; 38.

⁴¹ Friday.⁴² Saturday.

Mat. 28 ; 1.
Lu. 24 ; 1.
Jo. 20 ; 1.

- XVI. *WHEN the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might embalm Jesus.*
- 2 *And early in the morning, the first day of the week⁴³, they came to the monument about sunrise.* *And they said among themselves, Who will roll away the stone for us from the entrance of the monument? (for it was very large.)*
- 4 *But when they looked, they saw that the stone*
- 5 *had been rolled away. Then entering the monument, they beheld a youth sitting on the right side, clothed in a white robe, and they were*
- 6 *frightened. But he said to them, Be not frightened; ye seek Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified. He is risen: he is not here: behold*
- 7 *the place where they laid him. But go, say to his disciples, and to Peter, 'He is gone before 'you to Galilee; where ye shall see him, as*
- 8 *'he told you.' The women then getting out, fled from the monument, seized with trembling and consternation; but said nothing to any one, they were so terrified.*
- 9 *Jesus having arisen early the first day of the week, appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out*
- 10 *of whom he had cast seven demons. She went and informed those who had attended him, who*
- 11 *were in affliction and tears. But when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen by her, they did not believe it.*
- 12 *Afterwards, he appeared in another form to two of them, as they travelled on foot into the*

Jo. 20 ; 14.

Lu. 24 ; 13.

⁴³ Sunday.

13 *country. These being returned, acquainted the other disciples, but neither did they believe them.*

14 *At length he appeared to the eleven, as they were eating, and reproached them with their incredulity and obstinacy in disbelieving those*

Lu. 24; 36.
Jo. 20; 19.
Mat. 28; 19.

15 *who had seen him after his resurrection. And he said unto them, Go throughout all the world, proclaim the good tidings to the whole crea-*

16 *tion. He who shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved; but he who will not believe*

17 *shall be condemned. And these miraculous powers shall attend the believers. In my*

18 *name they shall expel demons. They shall speak languages unknown to them before.*

Acts, 16; 18.
Acts, 2; 4.
& 10; 46.
Acts, 28; 5.
Acts, 28; 8.

18 *They shall handle serpents [with safety.] And if they drink poison, it shall not hurt them. They shall cure the sick, by laying their hands upon them.*

19 *NOW, after the Lord had spoken to them, he was taken up into heaven, and sat down at*

Lu. 24; 51.

20 *the right hand of God. As for them, they went out and proclaimed the tidings every where, the Lord co-operating with them, and confirming their doctrine by the miracles wherewith it was accompanied.*

Heb. 2; 4.

PREFACE

TO

LUKE'S GOSPEL.

LUKE, to whom this Gospel, the third in order, has been, from the earliest ecclesiastical antiquity, uniformly attributed, was, for a long time, a constant companion of the Apostle Paul, and assistant in preaching the Gospel, as Mark is said to have been of the Apostle Peter. Of Luke, we find honourable mention made once and again in Paul's Epistles¹. But the most of what we can know of his history, must be collected from the Acts of the Apostles, a book also written by him in continuation of the history contained in the Gospel. Though the Author, like the other Evangelists, has not named himself as the author, he has signified plainly in the introduction of his work, that he is not an apostle, nor was himself a witness of what

¹ Col. iv. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

he attests, but that he had his intelligence from apostles and others who attended our Lord's ministry upon the earth.

§ 2. It has been made a question whether he was originally a Jew or a Pagan. The latter opinion has been inferred from an expression of the Apostle Paul to the Colossians², where, after naming some with this addition, *who are of the circumcision*, he mentions others, and among them Luke, without any addition. These are, therefore, supposed to have been Gentiles. But this, though a plausible inference, is not a necessary consequence from the Apostle's words. He might have added the clause, *who are of the circumcision*, not to distinguish the persons from those after mentioned as *not of the circumcision*, but to give the Colossians particular information concerning those with whom perhaps they had not previously been acquainted. If they knew what Luke, and Epaphras, and Demas, whether Jews or Gentiles, originally were, the information was quite unnecessary with regard to them. It will perhaps add a little to the weight of this consideration to observe that, in those days, in introducing to any church such Christian brethren as were unknown to them before, it was a point of some importance to inform them, whether they were of the circumcision, or not; inasmuch as there were certain ceremonies and observances wherein the Jewish converts were indulged, which,

² Chap. iv. 10—14.

if found in one converted from Gentilism, might render it suspected, that his conversion was rather to Judaism than to Christianity.

§ 3. SOME ancients, on the contrary, have imagined that he was not only a Jew, but one of the Seventy, commissioned by our Lord to preach the Gospel³. This, I think, may be confuted from what is advanced by Luke himself, who does not pretend to have been a witness of our Lord's miracles and teaching; but to have received his information from witnesses. This would not have been done by one who had attended our Lord's ministry, and was, though not an apostle, of the number of his disciples. I am not ignorant that Whitby⁴, after others, has attempted so to explain the words, as to make what is said concerning the information received from witnesses, to relate only to those who had published their narratives before that time, and that the phrase *παρηκολουθηκοτι ανωθεν πασιν ακριβως*, is intended for marking the distinction between their source of intelligence and his. In my opinion, he has totally mistaken the import of this clause, as I shall show in explaining the place⁵. But that our Evangelist was, with all the other writers of the New Testament, a convert to Christianity from Judaism, not from Gentilism, is, upon the whole, sufficiently evident from his style, in which, notwithstanding its

³ Luke, x. 1.

⁴ Preface to the Gospel of St. Luke.

⁵ Chap. i. 3. N.

greater copiousness and variety, there are as many Hebraisms as are found in the other Evangelists, and such as, I imagine, could not be exemplified in any writer, originally Gentile, unless his conversion to Judaism had been very early in life.

§ 4. FURTHER, Luke seems to have had more learning than any of the other Evangelists. And if he be the person mentioned in the above cited passage of the Epistle to the Colossians⁶, of which I see no reason to doubt; he was by profession *a physician*. Grotius has hence inferred several particulars which, as they are not supported by any positive proofs, can be ranked only among conjectures. The reason which Luke himself assigned for his writing was, it would appear, to prevent people's giving, without examination or inquiry, too easy credit to the narratives of the life of Jesus, which, at that time, seem to have abounded. I acknowledge that the word *επεχειρησαν*, *have undertaken*, used here by Luke, does not necessarily imply any blame laid on the execution; but the scope of the place seems to imply it, if not on all, at least on some of these undertakings: for if all, or even most, were well executed, the number was an argument rather against a new attempt, than for it. The very circumstance of the number of such narratives, at so early a period, is itself an evidence that there was something in the first publication of the Christian

⁶ Chap. iv. 14.

doctrine, which, notwithstanding the many unfavourable circumstances wherewith it was attended, excited the curiosity, and awakened the attention, of persons of all ranks and denominations; inso-much that every narrative which pretended to furnish men with any additional information concerning so extraordinary a personage as Jesus, seems to have been read with avidity.

§ 5. WHO they were to whom the Evangelist alludes, who had, from vague reports, rashly published narratives not entirely to be depended on, it is impossible for us now to discover. Grotius justly observes, that the spurious Gospels mentioned by ancient writers, are forgeries, manifestly, of a later date. He seems to except the Gospel according to the Egyptians, which, though much earlier than the rest, can scarcely claim an antiquity higher than that according to Luke. That there were, however, some such performances at the time Luke began to write, the words of this Evangelist are sufficient evidence; for, to consider this book merely on the footing of a human composition, what writer of common sense would introduce himself to the public by observing the numerous attempts that had been made by former writers, some of whom at least had not been at due pains to be properly informed, if he himself were actually the first, or even the second, or the third, who had written on the subject; and if one of the two who preceded him, had better opportunities of knowing than he, and the other fully as good?

But the total disappearance of those spurious writings, probably no better than hasty collections of flying rumours, containing a mixture of truth and falsehood, may, after the genuine Gospels were generally known and read, be easily accounted for. At midnight the glimmering of a taper is not without its use; but it can make no conceivable addition to the light of the meridian sun. And it deserves to be remarked, by the way, that, whatever may be thought to be insinuated here by the Evangelist, concerning the imperfect information of former historians, there is no hint given of their bad design.

§ 6. SOME have inferred from Luke's introduction, that his must have been the first genuine Gospel that was committed to writing. In my opinion this would need to be much more clearly implied in the words than it can be said to be, to induce a reasonable critic to adopt an opinion so repugnant to the uniform voice of antiquity. The remark of Grotius, on this head, appears to have more weight than is commonly allowed it. Luke, he observes, wrote in Greek, Matthew's Gospel had been written in the Hebrew of the times, and probably was not then translated into Greek. The expression of Papias implies, in my opinion, as was hinted already ⁷, that that Gospel remained a considerable time without any translation into Greek. If so, the only authentic Gos-

⁷ Preface to Matthew's Gospel, § 6.

pel which had preceded Luke's in Greek, was the Gospel by Mark, which comparatively was but a compend.

The arguments (if we can call them arguments) in Basnage's exertions, employed to prove that the Gospel by Luke was the first written, will be found, on examination, to rest on nothing but conjectures supported by reasonings which, to a superficial view, may appear ingenious, but are merely hypothetical, and can never overturn the only adequate evidence of a point of fact, the testimony of those who had best occasion to know, in a matter which they were under no conceivable temptation to misrepresent.

§ 7. LUKE, in composing this Gospel, is supposed by some to have drawn his information chiefly from the Apostle Paul, whom he faithfully attended, as Mark did from the Apostle Peter. They even proceed so far as to suppose that when Paul, in his Epistles, uses the expression *my Gospel*⁸, he means the Gospel according to Luke: but nothing can be more unnatural than this interpretation. That Paul, who was divinely enlightened in all that concerned the life and doctrine of his Master, must have been of very great use to the Evangelist, cannot be reasonably doubted; yet, from Luke's own words, we are led to conclude, that the chief source of his intelligence, as to the facts related in his Gospel, was

⁸ Rom. ii. 16. xvi. 25. 2 Tim. ii. 8.

from those who had been eye (and ear-) witnesses of what our Lord both did and taught. Now of this number Paul evidently was not. But, though Luke appears to have been an early and assiduous attendant on the ministry of that Apostle, and to have accompanied him regularly in his apostolical journeys, from his voyage to Macedonia, till he was carried prisoner to Rome, whither also the Evangelist went along with him, he could not fail to have many opportunities, both before and after joining him, of conversing with those Apostles and other disciples who had heard the discourses, and seen the miracles, of our Lord.

§ 8. As to the time when this Gospel was written, hardly any thing beyond conjecture has yet been produced. The same may be said of the place of publication. Jerom thinks it was published in Achaia, when Paul was in that country, attended by Luke; and by the computation of Euthymius, it was fifteen years after our Lord's ascension; but Paul's journey into Achaia could not have been so early. Grotius supposes that both the Gospel and the Acts were written soon after Paul left Rome, to travel into Spain. His principal reason seems to have been, because the latter of these histories ends nearly about that time, to wit, when Paul was first a prisoner at Rome. But though this may be admitted to be a very strong presumption, that the Acts of the Apostles were composed then, it affords no sort of evidence that the Gospel may not have been

composed and published long before. That it actually was some time before the other, appears to me the more probable supposition of the two. By the introduction to the Gospel, where the author particularly addresses himself to his friend Theophilus, his whole intention at that time appears to have been to give a history of our Lord's life, teaching, and miracles. And even in concluding the Gospel, no hint is given of any continuation or further history then in view. Again, in the beginning of the Acts, when he addresses the same friend, he speaks of the Gospel as of a treatise which he had composed on a former occasion, and which was then well known. And as to the place of publication, though nothing certain can be affirmed concerning it. I am inclined to think it more probable that it was Antioch, or at least some part of Syria, if not Palestine. Every thing here seems addressed to those who were well acquainted with Jewish customs and places. No hints are inserted, by way of explanation, as we find in the Gospels of Mark and John.

§ 9. BUT, though no certainty can be had about the precise time and place of publication, we have, in regard to the Author, the same plea of the uniform testimony of Christian antiquity, which was pleaded in favour of the preceding Evangelists, Matthew and Mark. Some indeed have thought that, as an Evangelist, Luke has the testimony of Paul himself, being, as they suppose,

the brother whose praise is in the Gospel, mentioned in one of his Epistles⁹. But admitting that Luke is the person there intended, another meaning may, with greater plausibility, be put on the expression *in the Gospel*, which rather denotes in preaching the Gospel, than in writing the history of its Author. The name Evangelist was first applied to those extraordinary ministers, such as Philip and Timothy, both expressly called so¹⁰, who attended the Apostles, and assisted them in their work. Luke was doubtless an Evangelist in this sense, as well as in the current, but later, acceptance of the term. It may, indeed, be justly affirmed, that Paul appears to have been the first who has quoted this gospel, though he does not name Luke, and quoted it as of authority. In writing to Timothy¹¹, he has these words, *For the Scripture saith*, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," and "The labourer is worthy of his reward." The former of these sayings is a quotation from the pentateuch¹². The latter is found no where else in these terms, but in Luke¹³, whose very words the Apostle has adopted. *Αξιός ὁ εργατῆς τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ*. Lardner has taken notice of allusions to some passages in this Gospel to be found in some of the apostolic fathers; and there are evident quotations from it, though without naming the author, in Justin Martyr, and the Epistle of the churches of Vienne and

⁹ 2 Cor. viii. 18.

¹⁰ Acts, xxi. 8. ² Tim. iv. 5.

¹¹ 1 Tim. v. 18.

¹² Deut. xxv. 4.

¹³ Luke, x. 7.

Lyons. Tatian, a little after the middle of the second century, composed a Harmony of the Gospels, the first of the kind that had been attempted, which he called *DIATESSARON* (*δια τεσσαρων*) of the *four*, and which demonstrates that, at that time, there were four Gospels, and no more, of established authority in the church. Irenæus, not long after, mentions all the Evangelists by name, arranging them according to the order wherein they wrote, which is the same with that universally given them, throughout the Christian world, to this day. When he speaks of Luke, he recites many particulars which are peculiar to that Gospel. And, though the reasons assigned by that ancient author, why the Gospels can be neither fewer, nor more, than four, we should justly consider as very whimsical; the attempt, though unsuccessful, to account for it, shows at least the certainty of the fact, that the four Gospels were then received by Christians of all denominations, and that beside them there was no gospel or history of Jesus, of any estimation in the church. From that time downwards, the four Evangelists are often mentioned; and whatever spurious narratives have, from time to time, appeared, they have not been able to bear a comparison with those, in respect either of antiquity or of intrinsic excellence. Early in the third century, Ammonius also wrote a Harmony of the four Gospels. As these were at that time, and had been from their first publication, so they continue to this day to be, regarded as the great foundations of the Christian faith. If Monsieur Freret had been so

lucky as to meet with Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel-history, and had taken the trouble to read it attentively before he wrote his *Examen Critique*, his natural penetration must have made him sensible, notwithstanding the artless simplicity of the English writer, how little his own much-laboured remarks can bear a comparison with the naked truth.

§ 10. THE Gospel by Luke has supplied us with many interesting particulars, which had been omitted by both his predecessors, Matthew and Mark. From him we learn whatever relates to the birth of John the Baptist; the annunciation; and other important circumstances concerning the nativity of the Messiah; the occasion of Joseph's being then in Bethlehem; the vision granted to the shepherds; the early testimonies of Simeon and Anna; the wonderful manifestation of our Lord's proficiency in knowledge, when only twelve years old; his age at the commencement of his ministry, connected with the year of the reigning emperor. He has given us also an account of several memorable incidents and cures which had been overlooked by the rest; the conversion of Zaccheus the publican; the cure of the woman who had been bowed down for eighteen years; and of the dropsical man; the cleansing of the ten lepers; the repulse he met with when about to enter a Samaritan city; and the instructive rebuke he gave, on that occasion, to two apostles, for their intemperate zeal: also the affecting interview he had, after his resurrection, with two of his disciples, in the way to Emmaus, and at that

village. Luke has likewise added many edifying parables to those which had been recorded by the other Evangelists. Of this number are the parable of the creditor who had two debtors; of the rich fool who hoarded up his increase, and, when he had not one day to live, vainly exulted in the prospect of many happy years of the rich man and Lazarus; of the reclaimed profligate; of the Pharisee and the publican praying in the temple; of the judge who was prevailed on by a widow's importunity, though he feared not God, nor regarded man; of the barren fig-tree; of the compassionate Samaritan; and several others; most of which, so early a writer as Irenæus has specified as peculiarly belonging to this Gospel; and has thereby shown to all after-ages, without intending it, that it is, in every thing material, the same book, which had ever been distinguished by the name of this Evangelist till his day, and remains so distinguished to ours.

§ 11. IN regard to Luke's character as a writer, it is evident, that though the same general quality of style, an unaffected simplicity, predominates in all the Evangelists; they are, nevertheless, distinguishable from one another. Luke abounds in Hebraisms as much as any of them; yet it must be acknowledged, that there are also more Grecisms in his language than in that of any of the rest. The truth is, there is greater variety in his style, which is probably to be ascribed to this circumstance, his having been more, and for a longer

time, conversant among the Gentiles than any other Evangelist. His ordinary place of abode, if not the place of his birth, appears to have been Antioch, the capital of Syria, the seat of government, where people of the first distinction in the province had their residence, and to which there was great resort of strangers. Here the Greek language had long prevailed. Besides, Luke's occupation, as a physician, may very probably have occasioned his having greater intercourse with those of higher rank. Not that the profession itself was then in great esteem in that country; for it has been justly observed, that in Rome, as well as in Syria, slaves who gave early signs of quickness of parts and manual dexterity, were often instructed in physic, who, if they proved successful, were commonly rewarded with their freedom. That Luke himself, whatever may have been his early condition in life, was, when a Christian minister, a freeman and master of his time, is evident from his attendance on the Apostle Paul in his peregrinations for the advancement of the Gospel. But the profession of medicine and surgery (for these two were then commonly united) not only proved the occasion of a more general intercourse with society, but served as a strong inducement to employ some time in reading. This may sufficiently account for any superiority this Evangelist may be thought to possess above the rest, in point of language.

§ 12. His name, *Λουκας*, *Luke*, rendered in one place¹⁴, in the common translation, *Lukas*, is supposed to have been a contraction of the Roman name, *Lucilius*, or of *Lucanus*, in like manner as *Demas* is contracted from *Demetrius*, and *Epaphras* from *Epaphroditus*. Names thus contracted from the master's name were commonly given to slaves, but not peculiarly to such. That a considerable portion of Luke's time had been spent in Rome, or at least in Italy, has been argued from some Latinisms discovered in his style; such as¹⁵, *δος εργασιαν*, *da operam*, *endeavour*; and *καλως ποιειτε τοις μισουσιν υμας*¹⁶, *Benefacite his qui oderrunt vos*, with the dative case, *Do good to them who hate you*; whereas, in the parallel place in Matthew¹⁷, the verb is construed more in the Greek manner with the accusative; *καλως ποιειτε τους μισουντας υμας*. But I see no reason why, in the Evangelist Luke, by birth a Syrian, this should be accounted a Latinism rather than a Syriasm, as in Syriac the ζ prefixed (which is necessary in the expression of this precept) is always considered as corresponding to the dative in Greek and Latin. That he has also a greater variety in his words and phrases than any of the other Evangelists, will be quickly discovered by an attentive reader of the original. I mention one evidence of this, from a circumstance I have had particular occasion to attend to, which is this: Each of the

¹⁴ Philem. 24.¹⁵ Ch. xii. 58.¹⁶ Ch. vi. 27.¹⁷ Matth. v. 44.

Evangelists has a considerable number of words which are used by none of the rest; but in Luke's Gospel, the number of such peculiarities, or words used in none of the other Gospels, is greater than that of the peculiar words found in all the three other Gospels put together. Again, some expressions which are frequent in the other Gospels, in Luke occur but rarely. The Hebrew word *Amen*, as an affirmative adverb joined with *λεγω υμιν*, and used for ushering in solemnly the instructions given by our Lord, is employed by Luke much seldomer than by any of the other Evangelists. Instead of it he sometimes says *αληθως*, sometimes *ναι*, and once *επ' αληθειας λεγω υμιν*, phrases never used by the rest. On the other hand, he oftener than they, employs the neuter article *το*, in reference not to a noun, but to a sentence, or part of a sentence. Of this there are at least seven instances in his Gospel¹⁸. I recollect but two in the rest, one in Matthew¹⁹, and one in Mark²⁰. As to these two, they are not parallel places to any of the passages wherein this mode of construction has been adopted by Luke. It may be observed, in passing, that the terms peculiar to Luke are for the most part long and compound words. The first word of his Gospel, *επειδηπερ*, is of the number. So much for what regards his words and idioms.

¹⁸ Luke, i. 62. ix. 46. xxii. 2. 4. 23, 24. 37.

¹⁹ Matth. xix. 18.

²⁰ Mark, ix. 23.

§ 13. As to the other qualities of his style, we may remark, that there is more of composition in the sentences than is found in the other three. Of this the very first sentence is an example, which occupies no fewer than four verses. In the passages, however, wherein those incidents are related, or those instructions given, which had been anticipated by Matthew or by Mark, there is sometimes, not always, a perfect coincidence with these Evangelists in the expression, as well as in the sense; sometimes, however, the coincidence in translations is more complete than in the original. I have observed that there are degrees, even in the simplicity of the sacred writers; for though all the Evangelists are eminent for this quality, there are some characteristic differences between one and another, which will not escape the notice of a reader of discernment. Matthew and John have more simplicity than Mark; and Luke has, perhaps, the least of all. What has been observed of the greater variety of his style, and of his more frequent use of complex sentences, may serve as evidence of this. And even as to the third species of simplicity formerly mentioned²¹, simplicity of design, he seems to approach nearer the manner of other historians, in giving what may be called his own verdict, in the narrative part of his work. I remember at least one instance of this. In speaking of the Pharisees, he calls them *φιλαργυροι*²², *lovers of money*. The distinction with regard to Judas, which it was proper in them

²¹ Diss. III. § 18, &c.

²² Ch. xvi. 14.

all to observe, as there were two of the name among the apostles, is expressed by Luke with more animation²³, *ὅς και εγενετο προδοτης, who proved a traitor*, than by Matthew²⁴, who says *ὁ και παραδους αυτον*; or by Mark²⁵, whose expression is, *ὅς και παρεδωκεν αυτον*; both which phrases, strictly interpreted, imply no more than *who delivered him up*. The attempt made by the Pharisees, to extort from our Lord what might prove matter of accusation against him, is expressed by Luke in language more animated than any of the rest, *ηρξαντο δεινωσ ενεχειν, και αποστοματιζειν αυτον περι πλειονων*²⁶, *began vehemently to press him with questions on many points*. On another occasion, speaking of the same people, he says, *Αυτοι δε επλησθησαν ανοιας*²⁷, *But they were filled with madness*. In the moral instructions given by our Lord, and recorded by this Evangelist, especially in the parables, none can be happier in uniting an affecting sweetness of manner with genuine simplicity. Of this union better instances cannot be imagined, than those of the humane Samaritan, and of the penitent prodigal.

§ 14. To conclude, though we have no reason to consider Luke as, upon the whole, more observant of the order of time than the other Evangelists, he has been at more pains than any of them, to ascertain the dates of some of the most memorable events on which, in a great measure, depend the

²³ Ch. vi. 16.²⁴ Ch. x. 4.²⁵ Ch. iii. 9.²⁶ Ch. xi. 53.²⁷ Ch. vi. 11.

dates of all the rest. In some places, however, without regard to order, he gives a number of detached precepts and instructive lessons, one after another, which probably have not been spoken on the same occasion, but are introduced as they occurred to the writer's memory, that nothing of moment might be omitted. In regard to the latter part of the life, and to the death of this Evangelist, antiquity has not furnished us with any accounts which can be relied on.

THE
GOSPEL BY LUKE.

- INTRODUCTION.

1. *FORASMUCH* as many have undertaken to
compose a narrative of those things which have
2 been accomplished amongst us, as they who were,
from the beginning, eye-witnesses, and after-
wards ministers of the word, delivered them to
3 us; I have also determined, having exactly
traced every thing from the first, to write a
particular account to thee, most excellent The-
4 ophilus; that thou mayest know the certainty
of those matters wherein thou hast been in-
structed.

SECTION I.

THE ANNUNCIATION.

- 5 *IN the days of Herod, king of Judea, there was*
 a priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abi-
 jah ; and his wife, named Elizabeth, was of the
 6 daughters of Aaron. They were both right-
 eous before God, blameless observers of all the
 7 Lord's commandments and ordinances. And
 they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren,
 and they were both advanced in years.
- 8 Now when he came to officiate as priest in
 9 the order of his course, it fell to him by lot, ac-
 cording to the custom of the priesthood, to offer
 incense in the sanctuary. And while the in-
 10 cense was burning, the whole congregation were
 11 praying without. Then there appeared to him
 a messenger of the Lord, standing on the right
 12 side of the altar of incense. And Zacharias
 was discomposed at the sight, and in great ter-
 13 ror. But the angel said to him, Fear not,
 Zacharias ; for thy prayer is heard, and Eliza-
 beth thy wife shall bear thee a son, whom thou
 14 shalt name John²⁸. He shall be to thee matter
 of joy and transport ; and many shall rejoice

1 Chr. 24 ; 10.
 Ex. 30 ; 7.
 Lev 16 ; 17.

²⁸ *The Lord's favour.*

SECT. I.

CH. I.

15 because of his birth. For he shall be great before the Lord; he shall not drink wine, nor any fermented liquor; but he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's

16 womb. And many of the sons of Israel he

17 shall bring back to the Lord their God. Moreover, he shall go before them in the spirit and power of Elijah, to reconcile fathers to their children, and, by the wisdom of the righteous, to render the disobedient a people well disposed for the Lord. *And Zacharias said to the angel,* Whereby shall I know this: for I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years?

19 *The angel answering, said unto him,* I am Gabriel²⁹, who attend in the presence of God, and

20 am sent to tell thee this joyful news. But know that thou shalt be dumb, and shalt not recover thy speech, until the day when these things happen; because thou hast not believed my words, which shall be fulfilled in due time.

21 *Meantime the people waited for Zacharias, and wondered that he staid so long in the sanctuary. But when he came out, he could not speak to them; and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the sanctuary; for he made them understand by signs, and remained speech-*

23 *less. And when his days of officiating were*

24 *expired, he returned home. Soon after, Elizabeth his wife conceived, and lived in retirement*

25 *five months, and said,* The Lord hath done this for me, purposing now to deliver me from the reproach I lay under among men.

Mal. 4; 6.
Mat. 11; 14.

CH. 1.

SECT. I.

- 26 *NOW* in the sixth month God sent Gabriel
his messenger, to Nazareth, a city of Galilee ;
27 to a virgin betrothed to a man called Joseph, of
the house of David; and the virgin's name was
28 Mary. When the angel entered, he said to her,
Hail, favourite of heaven! the Lord be with
29 thee, thou happiest of women! *At his appear-*
ance and words she was perplexed, and revolv-
ed in her mind what this salutation could mean.
30 *And the angel said to her,* Fear not, Mary, for
31 thou hast found favour with God. And behold,
thou shalt conceive and bear a son, whom thou
32 shalt name Jesus³⁰. He shall be great, and
shall be called the Son of the Highest. And
the Lord God will give him the throne of Da-
33 vid his father. And he shall reign over the
house of Jacob for ever: his reign shall never
34 end. *Then said Mary to the angel,* How shall
this be, since I have no intercourse with man?
35 *The angel answering, said unto her,* The Holy
Spirit will descend upon thee, and the power
of the Highest will overshadow thee; there-
fore the Holy progeny shall be called the Son
36 of God. And lo, thy cousin Elizabeth also
hath conceived a son in her old age; and she
who is called barren, is now in her sixth
37 month: for nothing is impossible with God.
38 *And Mary said,* Behold the handmaid of the
Lord. Be it unto me according to thy word.
Then the angel departed.
39 *In those days Mary set out and travelled*

Is. 7; 14.
Mat. 1; 21.
ch. 2; 21.
Dan. 7; 14.

³⁰ Saviour.

SECT. I.

CH. I.

expeditiously into the hill-country, to a city of
 40 *Judah; where having entered the house of*
 41 *Zacharias, she saluted Elizabeth. As soon as*
Elizabeth heard Mary's salutation, the babe
leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled
 42 *with the Holy Spirit, and cried with a loud*
voice, Thou art the most blessed of women,
 43 *and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. But*
how have I deserved this honour, to be visited
 44 *by the mother of my Lord! for know, that as*
soon as the sound of thy salutation reached
mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for
 45 *joy. And happy is she who believed, that the*
things which the Lord hath promised her, shall
be performed.

46 *Then Mary said, My soul magnifieth the*
Lord, and my spirit rejoiceth in God my Sa-
 48 *viour; because he hath not disdained the low*
condition of his handmaid, for henceforth all
 49 *posterity will pronounce me happy. For the Al-*
mighty whose name is venerable, hath done
 50 *wonders for me. His mercy on them who fear*
him, extendeth to generations of generations.
 51 *He displayeth the strength of his arm, and dis-*
 52 *pelleth the vain imaginations of the proud. He*
pulleth down potentates from their thrones, and
 53 *exalteth the lowly. The needy he loadeth with*
benefits; but the rich he spoileth of every
 54 *thing. He supporteth Israel his servant (as he*
 55 *promised to our fathers,) ever inclined to mer-*
 56 *cy towards Abraham and his race. And Mary,*
after staying with Elizabeth about three months,
returned home.

Ps. 33; 10.
 Eze. 21; 26.
 1 Sam. 2; 6.
 Ps. 34; 10.
 Is. 41; 8.
 Gen. 17; 19.
 22; 18.

SECTION II.

THE NATIVITY.

57 *WHEN* the time for Elizabeth's delivery was
58 come, she brought forth a son : and her neigh-
bours and relations who heard that the Lord
had shown her great kindness, congratulated
59 with her. And on the eighth day, when they
came to the child's circumcision, they would
have him called by his father's name, Zacharias.
60 And his mother interposed, saying, No ; but
61 he shall be called John. They said unto her,
There is none of thy kindred of that name.
62 They therefore asked his father by signs, how
63 he would have him called. He having demand-
ed a table-book, wrote thereon, " His name is
64 " John," which surprised them all. And his
mouth was opened directly, and his tongue
65 [loosed.] And he spake, praising God. Now
all in the neighbourhood were struck with awe ;
and the fame of these things spread throughout
66 all the hill-country of Judea. And all who
heard these things, pondering them in their
hearts, said, What will this child prove here-
after ? And the hand of the Lord was with him.

SECT. II.

CH. 2.

67 *Then Zacharias his father being filled with the*
 68 *Holy Spirit, prophesied, saying, Blessed be the*
 Lord the God of Israel, because he hath visit-
 69 ed and redeemed his people ; and (as anciently
 he promised by his holy Prophets) hath raised Ps. 132 ; 17.
 a prince for our deliverance in the house of
 71 David his servant ; for our deliverance from Jer. 23 ; 6.
 our enemies, and from the hands of all who & 30 ; 10.
 72 hate us ; in kindness to our forefathers, and
 73 remembrance of his holy covenant ; the oath Gen. 22 ; 16.
 74 which he swore to our father Abraham, to grant Jer. 31 ; 33.
 unto us, that being rescued out of the hands of
 75 our enemies, we might serve him boldly, in
 piety and uprightness, all the days of our life.
 76 And thou, child, shalt be called a Prophet of ch. 1 ; 17.
 the Most High ; for thou shalt go before the
 77 Lord, to prepare his way, by giving the knowl-
 edge of salvation to his people, in the remis-
 78 sion of their sins, through the tender compas- Mal. 4 ; 2.
 sion of our God, who hath caused a light to
 79 spring from on high to visit us, to enlighten
 those who abide in darkness and in the shades
 of death, to direct our feet into the way of
 peace.
 80 *Now the child grew, and acquired strength*
of mind, and continued in the deserts, until the
time when he made himself known to Israel.

II. *ABOUT that time Cesar Augustus issued an*
edict that all the inhabitants of the empire
should be registered. (This first register took
 2 *effect when Cyrenius³¹ was president of Syria.)*

³¹ In the Latin authors *Quirinius*.

Mat. 2 ; 4.
Jo. 7 ; 42.

- 3 *When all went to be registered, every one to his*
 4 *own city, Joseph also went from Nazareth, a*
 5 *city of Galilee, to the city of David in Judea*
 6 *called Bethlehem (for he was of the house and*
 7 *lineage of David,) to be registered, with Mary*
 8 *his betrothed wife, who was pregnant. While*
 9 *they were there, the time came that she should*
 10 *be delivered. And she brought forth her first-*
 11 *born son, and swathed him, and laid him in a*
 12 *manger, because there was no room for them in*
 13 *the house allotted to strangers.*
- 14 *Now there were shepherds in the fields in*
 15 *that country, who tended their flocks by turns*
 16 *through the night-watches. On a sudden a*
 17 *messenger of the Lord stood by them, and a*
 18 *divine glory encompassed them with light, and*
 19 *they were frightened exceedingly. But the an-*
 20 *gel said to them, Fear not; for lo I bring you*
 21 *good tidings which shall prove matter of great*
 22 *joy to all the people; because to day is born*
 23 *unto you, in the city of David, a Saviour, who*
 24 *is the Lord Messiah. And by this ye shall*
 25 *know him; ye shall find the babe in swaddling*
 26 *bands, lying in the manger. Instantly the an-*
 27 *gel was attended by a multitude of the heavenly*
 28 *host, who praised God, saying, Glory to God in*
 29 *the highest heaven, and peace upon the earth,*
 30 *and good will towards men.*
- 31 *And when the angels returned to heaven,*
 32 *having left the shepherds, these said one to*
 33 *another, Let us go to Bethlehem, and see this*
 34 *which hath happened, whereof the Lord hath*
 35 *informed us. And hastening thither, they found*

SECT. II.

CH. 2.

*Mary and Joseph with the babe who lay in the
17 manger. When they saw this, they published
what had been imparted to them concerning this
18 child. And all who heard it, wondered at the
19 things told them by the shepherds. But Mary
let none of these things escape unobserved,
weighing every circumstance within herself.
20 And the shepherds returned, glorifying and
praising God for all that they had heard and
seen, agreeably to what had been declared unto
them.*

21 *ON the eighth day, when the child was cir-* Gen. 17; 12.
ch. 1; 31.
cumcised, they called him Jesus, the angel hav-
ing given him that name before his mother con-
ceived him.

22 *AND when the time of their purification was* Lev. 12; 2.
expired, they carried him to Jerusalem, as the
law of Moses appointeth, to present him to the
23 *Lord (as it is written in the law of God,*
“Every male, who is the first-born of his mother, Ex. 13; 2.
Num. 8; 17.
24 *“is consecrated to the Lord” :) and to offer the*
sacrifice enjoined in the law, a pair of turtle-
doves, or two young pigeons.

25 *Now there was at Jerusalem a man named*
Simeon, a just and a religious man, who ex-
pected the consolation of Israel; and the Holy
26 *Spirit was upon him, and had revealed unto*
him, that he should not die until he had seen
27 *the Lord’s Messiah. This man came, guided*
28 *by the Spirit, into the temple. And when the*
parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for

CH. 2.

SECT. II.

him what the law required, he took him into his
 29 arms, and blessed God, and said, Now, Lord,
 thou dost in peace dismiss thy servant, accord-
 30 ing to thy word ; for mine eyes have seen the
 31 Saviour, whom thou hast provided in the sight
 32 of all the world ; a luminary to enlighten the
 nations, and be the glory of Israel thy people.

33 *And Joseph, and the mother of Jesus, heard
 with admiration the things spoken concerning
 34 him. And Simeon blessed them, and said to
 Mary his mother, This child is destined for the
 fall and the rise of many in Israel, and to
 35 serve as a mark for contradiction (yea, thine
 own soul shall be pierced as with a javelin ;)
 that the thoughts of many hearts may be dis-
 closed.*

36 *There was also a prophetess, Anna, daughter
 of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher, in an ad-
 vanced age, who had lived seven years with a
 37 husband, whom she married when a virgin ; and
 being now a widow of about eighty-four years,
 departed not from the temple, but served God
 38 in prayer and fasting night and day ; she also
 coming in at that instant, gave thanks to the
 Lord, and spake concerning Jesus to all those
 in Jerusalem who expected deliverance.*

39 *After they had performed every thing re-
 quired by the law of the Lord, they returned
 40 to Galilee, to their own city Nazareth. And
 the child grew and acquired strength of mind,
 being filled with wisdom, and adorned with a
 divine gracefulness.*

Is. 8 ; 14.
 Ro. 9 ; 32.
 1 Pet. 2 ; 7.

SECTION III.

THE BAPTISM.

41 *NOW* the parents of Jesus went yearly to Je-
 42 *rusalem* at the feast of the passover. *And* Ex. 23; 14.
Deut. 16; 1.
when he was twelve years old, they having gone
thither, according to the usage of the festival,
 43 *and remained the customary time; being on*
their return, the child Jesus staid behind in
Jerusalem, and neither Joseph nor his mother
 44 *knew it. They supposing him to be in the com-*
pany, went a day's journey, and then sought
him among their relations and acquaintance;
 45 *but not finding him, they returned to Jerusalem,*
 46 *seeking him. And after three days, they found*
him in the temple, sitting among the doctors,
both hearing them, and asking them questions.
 47 *And all who heard him were astonished; but*
 48 *they who saw him were amazed at his under-*
standing and answers. And his mother said to
him, Son, why hast thou treated us thus? Behold,
thy father and I have sought thee with sorrow.
 49 *He answered, Why did ye seek me? Knew ye*
 50 *not that I must be at my Father's? But they*
did not comprehend his answer.

CH. 3.

SECT. III.

51 *And he returned with them to Nazareth, and was subject unto them. And his mother treas-*
 52 *ured up all these things in her memory. And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in power with God and man.* Oct. 13. 1857.

III. *NOW* in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, Pontius Pilate being procurator of Judea, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, Philip his brother tetrarch of Iturea, and the province of Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene,

2 in the high priesthood of Annas³¹ and Caiaphas, the word of God came, in the wilderness,

3 to John the son of Zacharias. And he went through all the country along the Jordan, publishing the baptism of reformation for the

4 mission of sins. As it is written in the book of the Prophet Isaiah, "The voice of one pro-

5 "claiming in the wilderness, prepare a way
 "for the Lord³², make for him a straight pas-

6 "sage. Let every valley be filled, every moun-
 "tain and hill be levelled; let the crooked
 "roads be made straight, and the rough ways

7 "smooth, that all flesh may see the Saviour
 " [sent] of God." Then said he to the multitudes who flocked out to be baptized by him, Offspring of vipers, who hath prompted you

8 to flee from the impending vengeance? Produce then the proper fruits of reformation; and not say, within yourselves, 'We have 'Abraham for our father;' for I assure you.

Acts, 4; 6.
 Mat. 3; 1.
 Mar. 1; 2.
 Is. 40; 3.
 Jo. 1; 23.

Mat. 3; 7.

³¹ Called by Josephus, *Ananus*.

³² *Jehovah*.

SECT. III.

CH. 3.

that of these stones God can raise children to
9 Abraham. And even now the axe lieth at the
root of the trees. Every tree, therefore, which
produceth not good fruit, is felled and thrown
into the fire.

10 *Upon this the multitude asked him, What* 1 Jo. 3; 17.
Ja. 2; 15.

11 *must we do then? He answered, Let him who*
hath two coats impart to him who hath none;
and let him who hath victuals do the same.

12 *There came also publicans to be baptized, who*
13 *said, Rabbi, what must we do? He answered,*
Exact no more than what is appointed you.

14 *Soldiers likewise asked him, And what must*
we do? *He answered, Injure no man, either*
by violence, or false accusation, and be con-
tent with your allowance.

15 *As the people were in suspense concerning*
John, every man imagining within himself that

16 *he might be the Messiah, John addressed them*
all, saying, I indeed baptize in water; but one Mat. 3; 11.
Mar. 1; 7.
Jo. 1; 26.
Acts, 1; 5.
& 11; 16.
& 19; 4.
mightier than I cometh, whose shoe-latchet I
am not worthy to untie; he will baptize you

17 *in the Holy Spirit and fire: his winnowing*
shovel is in his hand, and he will thoroughly
cleanse his grain; he will gather the wheat
into his granary, and consume the chaff in un-
18 *quenchable fire. And with many other exhor-*
tations, he published the good tidings to the
people.

19 *But Herod the tetrarch having been reprov'd* Mat. 14; 3.
Mar. 6; 17.

by him, on account of Herodias his brother's
wife, and for all the crimes which Herod had
20 *committed, added this to the number, that he*
confined John in prison.

CH. 3.

SECT. III.

Mat. 3; 13.
 Mar. 1; 9.
 Jo. 1; 32.
 Mat. 17; 5.
 ch. 9; 35.
 2 Pet. 1; 17.
 Mat. 1; 1.

- 21 *NOW* when John baptized all the people,
 Jesus was likewise baptized; and while he
 22 prayed, the heaven was opened, and the Holy
 Spirit descended upon him in a bodily form,
 like a dove, and a voice came from heaven,
 which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee
 23 I delight. Now Jesus was himself about thirty
 years in subjection, being (as was supposed) a
 24 son of Joseph, son of Heli, son of Matthat, son
 of Levi, son of Melchi, son of Janna, son of
 25 Joseph, son of Mattathias, son of Amos, son of
 Nahum, son of Esli, son of Naggai, son of
 26 Maath, son of Mattathias, son of Shimei, son of
 27 Joseph, son of Judah, son of Joanna, son of
 Reza, son of Zerubbabel, son of Salathiel, son of
 28 Neri, son of Melchi, son of Addi, son of Co-
 29 sam, son of Elmodam, son of Er, son of Joses,
 son of Eliezer, son of Jorim, son of Matthat,
 30 son of Levi, son of Simeon, son of Judah, son
 31 of Joseph, son of Jonan, son of Eliakim, son
 of Meleah, son of Mainan, son of Mattatha,
 32 son of Nathan, son of David, son of Jesse, son
 of Obed, son of Boaz, son of Salmon, son of
 33 Nahson, son of Amminadab, son of Ram, son
 34 of Hezron, son of Pharez, son of Judah, son
 of Jacob, son of Isaac, son of Abraham, son of
 35 Terah, son of Nahor, son of Serug, son of Reu,
 36 son of Peleg, son of Eber, son of Salah, son
 of Cainan, son of Arphaxad, son of Shem, son of
 37 Noah, son of Lamech, son of Methuselah, son
 of Enoch, son of Jared, son of Mehalaliel, son
 38 of Cainan, son of Enos, son of Seth, son of
 Adam, son of God.

SECT. III.

CH. 4.

- IV. *NOW* Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit
- 2 into the wilderness, where he continued forty days, and was tempted by the devil. Having eaten nothing all that time, when it was ended,
- 3 he was hungry. And the devil said to him, If thou be a Son of God, command this stone to
- 4 become bread. Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, "Man liveth not by bread only, but
- 5 "by whatever God pleaseth." Then the devil having brought him to the top of a high mountain, showed him all the kingdoms of the earth
- 6 in an instant, and said to him, All this power and glory I will give thee; for it is delivered
- 7 to me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it; if, therefore, thou wilt worship me, it shall all be
- 8 thine. Jesus answering, said, It is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord³³ thy God, and
- 9 "shalt serve him only." Then he brought him to Jerusalem, and placing him on the battlement of the temple, said to him, If thou be a Son of
- 10 God, throw thyself down hence; for it is written, "He will give his angels charge concern-
- 11 "ing thee to keep thee; and in their arms they shall uphold thee, lest thou dash thy foot
- 12 "against a stone." Jesus answered, It is said, "Thou shalt not put the Lord³⁴ thy God to "the proof." When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a time.

Mat. 4; 1-
Mar. 1; 12-

Deut. 8; 3.

Deut. 6; 13.
10; 20.
1 Sam. 7; 3.

Ps. 91; 11.

Deut. 6; 16.

³³ Jehovah.³⁴ Jehovah.

SECTION IV.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

- Mat. 4 ; 12. 14 *THEN* Jesus, by the impulse of the Spirit, re-
 Mar. 1 ; 14. turned to Galilee, and his renown spread
 15 throughout the whole country, and he taught in
 their synagogues with universal applause.
 Mat. 13 ; 54. 16 Being come to Nazareth, where he had been
 Mar. 6 ; 1. brought up, he entered the synagogue, as his
 Jo. 4 ; 43. custom was, on the Sabbath day, and stood up
 17 to read. And they put into his hands the book
 of the Prophet Isaiah, and having opened the
 book, he found the place where it was written,
 Is. 61 ; 1. 18 "The Spirit of the Lord³⁵ is upon me, inas-
 " much as he hath anointed me to publish glad
 " tidings to the poor ; he hath commissioned
 " me to heal the broken-hearted, to announce
 " liberty to the captives, and recovery of sight
 19 " to the blind, to release the oppressed, to pro-
 " claim the year of acceptance with the Lord³⁶."
 20 And having closed the book, and returned it to
 the servant, he sat down. And the eyes of all in
 21 the synagogue were fixed upon him. And he
 began with saying to them, This very day the

³⁵ Jehovah.³⁶ Jehovah.

SECT. IV.

CH. 4.

Scripture which ye have just now heard is fulfilled. *And all extolled him ; but being astonished at the words full of grace which he uttered, they said, Is not this Joseph's son? He said unto them, Ye will doubtless apply to me this proverb, ' Physician, cure thyself.' Do as great things here in thine own country, as we hear thou hast done in Capernaum. But in fact, added he, no Prophet was ever well received in his own country. I tell you of a truth, there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when heaven was shut up for three years and a half, so that there was great famine throughout all the land : yet to none of them was Elijah sent, but to a widow in Sarepta³⁷ of Sidonia. There were likewise many lepers in Israel in the days of Elisha the Prophet : and Naaman the Syrian was cleansed, but none of those. On hearing this, the whole synagogue were enraged, and breaking up, drove him out of the city, and brought him to the brow of the mountain whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. But he passing through the midst of them, went away. Then he came to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the Sabbath. And they were astonished at his manner of teaching ; for he spoke with authority.*

Now there was in the synagogue a man possessed by the spirit of an unclean demon, who

1 Ki. 17 ; 9.

2 Ki. 5 ; 14.

Mat. 7 ; 28.
Mar. 1 ; 22.

Mar. 1 ; 23.

³⁷ In the Old Testament Zarephath.

CH. 4.

SECT. IV.

34 *roared out, saying, Ah! Jesus of Nazareth, what hast thou to do with us? Art thou come to destroy us? I know who thou art, the Holy*
 35 *one of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Be silent, and come out of him. Whereupon the demon, having thrown him down in the middle of the assembly, came out without harming*
 36 *him. And they were all in amazement, and said one to another, What meaneth this, that with authority and power he commandeth the*
 37 *unclean spirits, and they come out? Thenceforth his fame was blazed in every corner of the country.*

Mat. 8 ; 14
 Mar. 1 ; 29

38 *When he was gone out of the synagogue, he entered the house of Simon, whose wife's mother had a violent fever, and they entreated him on*
 39 *her behalf. Jesus standing near her, rebuked the fever, and it left her, and she instantly arose and served them.*

Mar. 1 ; 34.

40 *After sunset, all they who had any sick, of whatever kind of disease, brought them to him ; and he, laying his hands on every one, cured*
 41 *them. Demons also came out of many, crying out, Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God. But he rebuked them, and would not allow them to speak, because they knew that he was the Mes-*
 42 *siah. When it was day, he retired into a desert place ; and the multitude sought him out, and came to him, and urged him not to leave them ;*
 43 *but he said to them, I must publish the good tidings of the reign of God in other cities also,*
 44 *because for this purpose I am sent. Accordingly he made this publication in the synagogues of Galilee.*

SECT. IV.

CH. 5.

V. *ONE* time, as he stood by the lake of Gennezareth³⁸, the multitude pressing upon him to hear
 2 the word of God, he saw two barks aground
 near the edge, but the fishermen were on shore
 3 washing their nets. Having gone aboard one
 of them, which was Simon's, he desired him to
 put off a little from the land. Then he sat
 down, and taught the people out of the bark.

4 When he had done speaking, he said to Si-
 mon, Launch out into deep water, and let down
 5 your nets for a draught. Simon answered, Mas-
 ter, we have toiled all night, and have caught
 6 nothing; nevertheless, at thy word, I will let
 down the net. Having done this, they inclosed
 such a multitude of fishes, that the net began to
 7 break. And they beckoned to their companions
 in the other bark to come and help them. And
 they came and laded both the barks, so that they
 8 were near sinking. When Simon Peter saw
 this, he threw himself at Jesus' knees, crying,
 Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man.
 9 For the draught of fishes which they had taken
 had filled him and all his companions with ter-
 10 ror, particularly James and John, sons of Zebe-
 dee, who were Simon's partners. And Jesus
 said to Simon, Fear not, henceforth thou shalt
 11 catch men. And having brought their barks to
 land, they forsook all and followed him.

12 When he was in one of the neighbouring
 cities, a man covered with leprosy, happening to
 see him, threw himself on his face, and besought

Mat. 8; 2.
 Mar. 1; 40.

³⁸ In the Old Testament, *Chinnereth*.

CH. 5.

SECT. IV.

him, saying, Master, if thou wilt, thou canst
 13 cleanse me. *Jesus stretching out his hand, and
 touching him, said, I will; be thou cleansed.
 That instant his leprosy departed from him.*

Lev. 14; 3· 14 *And he commanded him to tell nobody. But
 go [said he,] show thyself to the priest, and
 present the offering appointed by Moses, for
 notifying to the people that thou art cleansed.*

15 *Yet so much the more was Jesus every where
 talked of, that vast multitudes flocked to hear
 him, and to be cured by him of their maladies.*

16 *And he withdrew into solitary places, and
 prayed.*

17 *ONE day, as he was teaching, and phari-
 sees, and doctors of law, who had come from Je-
 rusalem, and from every town of Galilee and
 Judea, were sitting by; the power of the Lord*

Mat. 9; 2·
 Mar. 2; 3· 18 *was exerted in the cure of the sick. And behold
 some men carrying on a bed a man afflicted with
 a palsy, endeavoured to bring him in, and place*

19 *him before Jesus; but finding it impracticable,
 by reason of the crowd, they gat upon the roof,
 and let him down through the tiling, with the*

ch. 7; 48. 20 *little bed in the midst before him. Jesus per-
 ceiving their faith, said to him, Man, thy sins*

21 *are forgiven thee. On which the scribes and
 the pharisees reasoned thus, 'Who is this that
 'speaketh blasphemies? Can any one forgive*

22 *'sins beside God?' Jesus knowing their thoughts,
 addressed himself to them, and said, What are*

23 *ye reasoning in your hearts? Whether is easier,
 to say, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee;' or to say*

24 *[with effect] 'Arise and walk?' But, that ye*

SECT. IV.

CH. 5.

may know that the Son of Man hath power upon the earth to forgive sins, Arise (*said he to the palsied man,*) take up thy bed, and return
 25 to thy house. *That instant he rose in their presence, took up his bed, and returned home,*
 26 *glorifying God. Seeing this, they were all struck with amazement and reverence, and glorified God, saying, We have seen incredible things to-day.*

27 *After this he went out, and observing a publican named Levi sitting at the toll-office, said to*
 28 *him, Follow me. And he arose, left all, and*
 29 *followed him. And Levi made him a great entertainment in his own house, where there*
 30 *was a great company of publicans and others at table with them. But the scribes and the pharisees of the place murmured, saying to his disciples,*
 31 *Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners? Jesus answering, said unto them,*
 32 *It is not the healthy, but the sick, who need a physician. I am come to call, not the righteous, but sinners, to reformation.*

Mat. 9; 9.
 Mar. 2; 14.

33 *Then they asked him, How is it that the disciples of John, and likewise those of the pharisees, frequently fast and pray, but thine eat and*
 34 *drink? He answered, Would ye have the bride-men fast, while the bridegroom is with them?*
 35 *But the days will come wherein the bridegroom shall be taken from them: in those days*
 36 *they will fast. He added this similitude, Nobody mendeth an old mantle with new cloth; otherwise the new will rend the old; besides, the old and the new will never suit each other.*

Mat. 9; 14.
 Mar. 2; 18.

CH. 6.

SECT. IV.

37 Nobody putteth new wine into old leathern bottles; otherwise the new wine will burst the bottles, and thus the wine will be spilled, and
 38 the bottles rendered useless. But if new wine be put into new bottles, both will be preserved.
 39 Besides, a man, after drinking old wine, calleth not immediately for new; for he saith, 'The old is milder.'

Mat. 12; 1.
 Mar. 2; 23.

VI. *ON the Sabbath called secondprime, as Jesus was passing through the cornfields, his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and rubbed them in*
 2 *their hands, and ate them. And some pharisees said to them, Why do ye that which it is not law-*
 3 *ful, on the Sabbath, to do? Jesus replying, said to them, Did ye never read what David and his*
 4 *attendants did, when they were hungry; how he entered the mansion of God, and took and ate the loaves of the presence, and gave also of this bread to his attendants; though it cannot*
 5 *be eaten lawfully by any but the priests? He added, The Son of Man is master even of the Sabbath.*

1 Sam. 21; 1.
 Lev. 24; 5.

6 *It happened also, on another Sabbath, that he went into the synagogue, and taught; and a man was there, whose right hand was blasted.*
 7 *Now the scribes and the pharisees watched to see whether he would heal on the Sabbath, that*
 8 *they might find matter for accusing him. But he knowing their thoughts, said to the man whose hand was blasted, Arise, and stand in the middle. And he arose and stood. Then Jesus*
 9 *said to them, I would ask you, What is it lawful to do on the Sabbath? Good or ill? To save*

Mat. 12; 9.
 Mar. 3; 1.

SECT. V.

CH. 6.

10 or to destroy? *And looking around on them all, he said to the man, Stretch out thy hand; and in doing this, his hand was rendered sound like*
 11 *the other. But they were filled with madness, and consulted together what they should do to Jesus.*

SECTION V.

THE NOMINATION OF APOSTLES.

12 *IN those days Jesus retired to a mountain to pray, and spent the whole night in an oratory.* Mat. 10; 2.
Mar. 3; 13.
 13 *When it was day, he called to him his disciples; and of them he chose twelve, whom he named*
 14 *Apostles. Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip*
 15 *and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James son of Alpheus, and Simon called the Zealous,* Jude, 1.
 16 *Judas brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, who proved a traitor.*
 17 *Afterward, Jesus coming down with them, stopped in a plain, whither a company of his disciples, with a vast multitude from all parts of Judea, Jerusalem, and the maritime country of Tyre and Sidon, were come to hear him, and*
 18 *to be healed of their diseases. Those also who were infested with unclean spirits, came and*
 19 *were cured. And every one strove to touch*

him, because a virtue came from him, which healed them all.

Mat. 5; 3.

20 *THEN* lifting his eyes on his disciples, he said, Happy ye poor, for the kingdom of God

21 is yours! Happy ye that hunger now, for ye shall be satisfied! Happy ye that weep now,

Is. 61; 3.
1 Pet. 3; 14,
and 4; 14.

22 for ye shall laugh! Happy shall ye be when men shall hate you, and separate you from their

society; yea, reproach and defame you, on account of the Son of Man! Rejoice on that day,

23 and triumph, knowing that your reward in heaven is great! for thus did their fathers treat the

Is. 65; 13.

24 Prophets. But woe unto you rich; for ye have received your comforts! Woe unto you

that are full; for ye shall hunger! Woe unto you who laugh now; for ye shall mourn and

26 weep! Woe unto you, when men shall speak well of you; for so did their fathers of the false prophets.

Mat. 5; 44.
Ro. 12; 20.

27 But I charge you, my hearers, love your enemies, do good to them who hate you, bless

28 them who curse you, and pray for them who traduce you. To him who smiteth thee on one

cheek, present the other; and from him who

Tob. 4; 16.

30 taketh thy mantle, withhold not thy coat. Give to every one who asketh thee; and from him

who taketh away thy goods, do not demand

Mat. 7; 12.

31 them back. And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye likewise unto them. For

32 if ye love those [only] who love you, what thanks are ye entitled to? since even sinners love those who love them. And if ye do good

SECT. V.

CH. 6.

to those [only] who do good to you, what thanks are ye entitled to? since even sinners
 34 do the same. And if ye lend to those [only] from whom ye hope to receive, what thanks are ye entitled to? since even sinners lend to
 35 sinners, that they may receive as much in return. But love ye your enemies, do good and lend, nowise despairing; and your reward shall be great; and ye shall be sons of the Most High; for he is kind to the ungrateful and
 36 malignant. Be therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful.

37 Judge not, and ye shall not be judged; con- Mat. 7; 1.
Ro. 2; 1.
 38 demn not, and ye shall not be condemned; re- Mar. 4; 24.
 lease, and ye shall be released; give, and ye shall get: good measure, pressed and shaken, and heaped, shall be poured into your lap; for with the same measure wherewith ye give to others, ye yourselves shall receive.

39 *He used also this comparison*: Can the blind Mat. 15; 14.
 guide the blind? Will not both fall into a ditch? Mat. 10; 24.

40 The disciple is not above his teacher; but every finished disciple shall be as his teacher.

41 And why observest thou the mote in thy brother's eye; but perceivest not the thorn in thine Jo. 13; 16.
Mat. 7; 3.

42 own eye? Or how canst thou say to thy brother, 'Brother, let me take out the mote which 'is in thine eye,' not considering that there is a thorn in thine own eye? Hypocrite, first take the thorn out of thine own eye: then thou wilt see to take out the mote which is in thy

43 brother's eye. That is not a good tree which Mat. 7; 18.
& 12; 33.

yieldeth bad fruit; nor is that a bad tree
 44 which yieldeth good fruit. For every tree is
 known by its own fruit. Figs are not gathered
 off thorns; nor grapes off a bramble-bush.
 45 The good man, out of the good treasure of his
 heart, bringeth that which is good: the bad
 man, out of the bad treasure of his heart, bring-
 eth that which is bad; for it is out of the ful-
 ness of his heart that his mouth speaketh.

Mat. 7; 21.
 Ro. 2; 13.
 Ja. 1; 22.

46 But why do ye, in addressing me, cry, Mas-
 ter, Master, and obey not what I command?
 47 Whoever cometh to me, and heareth my pre-
 cepts, and practiseth them, I will show you
 48 whom he resembleth: he resembleth a man
 who built a house, and digging deep, laid the
 foundation upon the rock: and when an inun-
 dation came, the torrent broke upon that house,
 but could not shake it; for it was founded upon
 49 the rock. But he who heareth, and doth not
 practise, resembleth a man who, without laying
 a foundation, built a house upon the earth;
 which, when the torrent brake against it, fell,
 and became a great pile of ruins.

Mat. 8; 5.

VII. *WHEN* he had finished his discourse in the
 audience of the people, he entered Capernaum.
 2 And a centurion's servant, who was dear to his
 3 master, was sick, and in danger of dying. And
 the centurion having heard concerning Jesus,
 sent to him Jewish elders, to entreat him to come
 4 and save his servant. When they came to
 Jesus, they earnestly besought him, saying, He

SECT. V.

CH. 7.

- 5 is worthy of this favour; for he loveth our nation; and it was he who built our synagogue.
- 6 *Then Jesus went with them; and when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him to say, Master, trouble not thyself; for I have not deserved that thou shouldst*
- 7 *come under my roof; wherefore neither thought I myself fit to come into thy presence: say but*
- 8 *the word, and my servant will be healed. For even I, who am under the authority of others, having soldiers under me, say to one, 'Go,' and he goeth, to another, 'Come,' and he cometh, and to my servant, 'Do this,' and he doeth it.*
- 9 *Jesus hearing these things, admired him, and turning, said to the multitude which followed, I assure you I have not found so great faith,*
- 10 *even in Israel. And they who had been sent having returned to the house, found the servant well who had been sick.*
- 11 *The day following, he went into a city called Nain, accompanied by his disciples and a great*
- 12 *crowd. As he approached the gate of the city, the people were carrying out a dead man, the only son of his mother, who was a widow; and*
- 13 *many of the citizens were with her. When the Lord saw her, he had pity upon her, and*
- 14 *said to her, Weep not. Then he advanced, and touched the bier (the bearers stopping) and said,*
- 15 *Young man, arise, I command thee. Then he who had been dead, sat up, and began to speak,*
- 16 *and Jesus delivered him to his mother. And all present were struck with awe, and glorified God, saying, A great Prophet hath arisen* ch. 24; 19.

CH. 7.

SECT. V.

among us; *and*, God hath visited his people.

17 *And this report concerning him spread throughout Judea and all the neighbouring country.*

Mat. 11; 2.

18 *NOW John's disciples having informed their master of all these things, he called two of them,*
19 *whom he sent to Jesus to ask him, Art thou he who cometh? or must we expect another?*

20 *Being come to him, they said, John the Baptist hath sent us to ask thee, Art thou he who cometh?*

21 *or must we expect another? At that very time Jesus was delivering many from diseases and maladies, and evil spirits, and giving sight*

Is. 55; 5.

22 *to many who were blind. And he returned this answer, Go, and report to John what ye have seen and heard: the blind are made to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear; the leprous are cleansed, the dead are raised, glad tidings is*
23 *brought to the poor. And happy is he to whom I shall not prove a stumbling-block.*

Is. 61; 1.

Mat. 11; 7.

24 *When John's messengers were departed, Jesus said to the multitude concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a*
25 *reed shaken by the wind? But what went ye out to see? a man effeminately dressed? It is in royal palaces [not in deserts] that they who wear splendid apparel, and live in luxury, are*
26 *found. What then did ye go to see? a prophet? yea, I tell you, and something superior to*

Mal. 3; 1.
Mar. 1; 2.

27 *a prophet. For this is he, concerning whom it is written, "Behold I send mine angel before*
28 *"thee, who shall prepare thy way." For I declare unto you, among those who are born*

SECT. VI.

CH. 7.

of women, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist; yet the least in the reign of God shall be greater than he. All the people, even the publicans, who heard John, have, by receiving baptism from him, honoured God; whereas the Pharisees and the lawyers, in not being baptized by him, have rejected the counsel of God with regard to themselves.

Whereunto then shall I compare the men of this generation? whom are they like? They are like children in the market-place, of whom their companions complain and say, 'We have played to you upon the pipe, but ye have not danced; we have sung mournful songs to you, but ye have not wept.' For John the Baptist is come abstaining from bread and from wine, and ye say, 'He hath a demon.' The Son of Man is come using both, and ye say, 'He is a lover of banquets and wine, an associate of publicans and sinners.' But wisdom is justified by all her children.

Mat. 11; 16.

Mat. 3; 4.
Mar. 1; 6.

SECTION VI.

SIGNAL MIRACLES AND INSTRUCTIONS.

NOW one of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him: and he went into the Pharisee's house, and placed himself at table. And behold

Jo. 11; 2.
& 12; 3.

a woman in the city who was a sinner, knowing that he ate at the house of the Pharisee,
 38 *brought an alabaster box of balsam, and standing behind at his feet weeping, bathed them with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and*
 39 *anointed them with the balsam. The Pharisee who had invited him, observing this, said within himself, ' If this man were a prophet, he would ' have known who this woman is that toucheth ' him, and of what character ; for she is a sin-*
 40 *' ner.' Then Jesus said to him, Simon, I have something to say to thee. He answered, Say*
 41 *it, Rabbi. A certain creditor had two debtors ; one owed five hundred denarii³⁹, the other fifty⁴⁰. But not having wherewith to pay, he freely forgave them both. Say then, which of*
 42 *them will love him most ? Simon answered, I*
 43 *suppose he to whom he forgave most. Jesus replied, Thou hast judged rightly. Then turning to the woman, he said to Simon, Thou seest this woman : when I came into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet, but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them*
 44 *with the hairs of her head. Thou gavest me no kiss ; but she, since she entered, hath not*
 45 *ceased kissing my feet. Thou didst not anoint my head with oil, but she hath anointed my*
 46 *feet with balsam. Wherefore, I tell thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven ; therefore her love is great. But he to whom little is*
 47 *forgiven, hath little love. Then he said to her,*
 48

³⁹ About 15l. 12s. sterling.

⁴⁰ About 1l. 11s. sterling.

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

49 Thy sins are forgiven. *Those who were at* Mat. 9 ; 2.
Mar. 2 ; 5.
ch. 5 ; 20.
table with him said within themselves, ' Who is
 50 *this that even forgiveth sins ?' But he said to*
the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee ; go in
peace.

VIII. *AFTERWARDS he travelled through cities*
and villages, proclaiming the joyful tidings of
the reign of God, being attended by the twelve,
 2 *and by certain women who had been delivered*
from evil spirits and distempers, Mary called Mar. 16 ; 9.
Magdalene, out of whom went seven demons,
 3 *Joanna wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, Susan-*
na, and several others who assisted him with their
property.

4 *Now when a great multitude was assembled,* Mat. 13 ; 3.
Mar. 4 ; 2.
and the people were flocking to him out of the
 5 *cities, he spake by a parable, The sower went*
out to sow his grain : and in sowing, part fell
by the way-side, and was crushed under foot,
 6 *or picked up by the birds ; part fell upon a*
rock, and when it was sprung up, withered
 7 *away for want of moisture ; part also fell*
among thorns, and the thorns grew up and
 8 *choked it ; and part fell into good soil, and*
sprang up, and yielded increase a hundred fold.
Having said this, he cried, Whoso hath ears to
hear, let him hear.

9 *And his disciples asked him, saying, What* Mat. 13 ; 10.
Mar. 4 ; 10.
Is. 6 ; 9.
 10 *meaneth this parable ? He answered, It is your*
privilege to know the secrets of the reign of
God, which to others are couched in parables,
that, though they look, they may not perceive ;
though they hear, they may not understand.

CH. 8.

SECT. VI.

Mat. 13; 18.
Mar. 4; 14.

11 Now this is the meaning of the parable.
 12 The seed is the word of God. By the way-side are meant those hearers out of whose hearts the devil coming taketh away the word, lest
 13 they should believe and be saved. By the rock are meant those who, when they hear, receive the word with joy, yet not having it rooted in them, are but temporary believers; for
 14 in the time of trial they fall off. By the ground encumbered with thorns, are meant those hearers who are entangled in the business, and pursuits, and pleasures of life, which stifle the word, so that it bringeth no fruit to
 15 maturity. But by the good soil are meant those, who, having heard the word, retain it in a good and honest heart, and persevere in bringing forth fruit.

Mat. 5; 15.
Mar. 4; 21.
Mat. 10; 26.
Mat. 25; 29.

16 A lamp is never lighted to be covered with a vessel, or put under a bed, but to be set on a stand, that they who enter may see the light.
 17 For there is no secret which shall not be discovered; nor any thing concealed which shall
 18 not be known and become public. Take heed, therefore, how ye hear; for to him who hath, more shall be given; but from him who hath not, shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.

Mat. 12; 46.
Mar. 3; 31.

19 *Then his mother and brothers came to speak with him, but could not get near him for the*
 20 *crowd. And it was told him by some persons,*
 Thy mother and thy brothers are without, de-
 21 siring to see thee. *But he answering, said*

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

unto them, My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God, and obey it.

- 22 *ONE day Jesus having gone into a bark* Mat. 8 ; 23.
Mat. 5 ; 35.
with his disciples, said to them, Let us cross
 23 *the lake. Accordingly they set sail. But*
while they sailed, he fell asleep, and there blew
such a storm upon the lake as filled the bark
 24 *with water, and endangered their lives. And*
they came to him, and awakened him, saying,
Master, master, we perish. Then he arose
and rebuked the wind, and the raging of the
water : and they ceased, and there was a calm.
 25 *And Jesus said to them, Where is your faith ?*
But they said one to another with fear and ad-
miration, Who is this that commandeth even
the winds and the water, and they obey him ?
 26 *And they arrived at the country of the Gada-*
renes which is opposite to Galilee.
 27 *Being come ashore, a man of the city met* Mat. 9 ; 28.
Mar. 5 ; 1.
him who had been long possessed by demons, and
who wore no clothes, and had no habitation but
 28 *the sepulchres. When he saw Jesus, he roared*
out, and threw himself at his feet, crying, What
hast thou to do with me, Jesus, Son of the
Most High God ? I beseech thee, do not tor-
 29 *ment me. (For he had ordered the unclean*
spirit to come out of the man ; for it had fre-
quently seized him, insomuch that, when he was
chained and fettered, he broke his bonds, and
 30 *was driven by the fiend into the desert.) Then*
Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name ?

OH. 8.

SECT. VI.

He answered, Legion, because many demons
 31 *had entered into him. And they entreated him*
that he would not command them to go into the
 32 *abyss, but, as there was a numerous herd of*
swine feeding on the mountain, that he would
permit them to enter into the swine. And he
 33 *permitted them. Then the demons, having quit-*
ted the man, entered into the swine; and the
herd rushed down a precipice into the lake,
 34 *and were drowned. The herdsmen seeing this,*
fled, and spread the news through the city and
 35 *villages. And the inhabitants flocked out to see*
what had happened. Being come to Jesus, and
finding the man, of whom the demons were dis-
possessed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed,
 36 *and in his right mind, they were afraid. But*
having been informed by the spectators, in what
 37 *manner the demoniac had been delivered, all*
the people of the country of the Gadarenes en-
treated him to leave them; for they were struck
with terror. Accordingly he re-entered the bark
 38 *and returned. Now the man out of whom the*
demons were gone, entreated his permission to
attend him. But Jesus dismissed him, saying,
 39 *Return home and relate what great things God*
hath done for thee. Then he departed and
published through all the city what great things
 40 *Jesus had done for him. Jesus, at his return,*
was welcomed by the crowd, who were all wait-
ing for him.

Mat. 9; 18.
 Mar. 5; 22.

41 *Meantime came a man named Jairus, a ruler*
of the synagogue, who, throwing himself at the
feet of Jesus, besought him to come into his

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

42 *house: for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, who was dying.*

As Jesus went along, the people crowded Mar. 5; 25.
 43 *him; and a woman, who had been twelve years afflicted with an issue of blood, and had consumed all her living upon physicians, none of*
 44 *whom could cure her, coming behind touched the tuft of his mantle; upon which her issue*
 45 *was stanch'd. Then Jesus said, Who touched me? When every body denied, Peter and those with him, answered, Master, the multitude throng and press thee, and dost thou say,*
 46 *'Who touched me?' Jesus replied, Somebody hath touched me; for I am sensible that my*
 47 *power was just now exerted. Then the woman perceiving that she was discovered, came trembling, and having thrown herself prostrate, declared to him, before all the people, why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately*
 48 *healed: and he said to her, Daughter, take courage, thy faith hath cured thee; go in peace.*

49 *While he was yet speaking, one came from* Mar. 5; 35.
the house of the director of the synagogue, who said, Thy daughter is dead, trouble not the
 50 *Teacher. Jesus hearing this, said to Jairus, Fear not; only believe, and she shall be well.*
 51 *Being come to the house, he allowed nobody to* Mar. 9; 25.
enter with him, except Peter and John and James, and the maiden's father and mother.
 52 *And all wept, and lamented her. But he said,*
 53 *Weep not; she is not dead, but asleep. And they derided him, knowing that she was dead.*
 54 *But he, having made them all retire, took her*

CH. 9.

SECT. VI.

- by the hand, and called, saying, Maiden, arise.
 55 And her spirit returned, and she arose immediately, and he commanded to give her food.
 56 And her parents were astonished, but he charged them not to mention to any body what had happened.

Mat. 10 ; 1.
 Mar. 3 ; 13.
 Mat. 10 ; 7.
 Mat. 6 ; 7.

IX. JESUS having convened the twelve, gave them power and authority over all the demons,

2 and to cure diseases, and commissioned them to proclaim the reign of God, and to heal the sick.

3 And he said to them, Provide nothing for your journey; nor staves, nor bag, nor bread, nor

4 silver, nor two coats a-piece; and continue in whatever house ye are received into, until ye

Acts, 13 ; 51.

5 leave the place. And wheresoever they will not receive you, shake even the dust off your

6 feet, as a protestation against them. They accordingly departed, and travelled through the villages, publishing the good tidings, and performing cures every where.

Mat. 14 ; 1.
 Mar. 6 ; 14.

7 Now Herod the tetrarch having heard of all that Jesus had done, was perplexed, because

some said, John is risen from the dead; some,

8 Elijah hath appeared; and others, One of the

9 ancient prophets is risen again. And Herod

said, John I beheaded: but who is this of

whom I hear such things? And he was desirous

to see him.

Mat. 14 ; 13.
 Mar. 6 ; 32.

10 Now the Apostles being returned, reported to Jesus all that they had done: and he, taking

them with him, retired privately to a desert be-

11 longing to the city of Bethsaida. When the multitude knew it, they followed him; and he receiv-

SECT. VII.

CH. 9.

- ing them, spoke to them concerning the reign of God, and healed those who had need of healing.*
- 12 *When the day began to decline, the twelve accosting him said, Dismiss the people, that they may go to the nearest towns and villages, and provide themselves in lodging and food; or we*
- 13 *are here in a desert. He answered, Supply them yourselves with food. They replied, We have only five loaves and two fishes; unless we go and buy victuals for all this people.*
- 14 *For they were about five thousand men. Then he said to his disciples, Make them lie down in*
- 15 *parties, fifty in a party. And they did so, making them all lie down. Then he took the five*
- 16 *loaves and the two fishes; and looking up to heaven, he blessed and brake them, and gave them to his disciples to set before the multitude.*
- 17 *When all had eaten, and were satisfied, they took up twelve baskets full of fragments.*

Mat. 14; 15.
Mar. 6; 35.
Jo. 6; 5.

 SECTION VII.

THE TRANSFIGURATION.

- 18 *AFTERWARDS, Jesus, having withdrawn from the multitude to pray apart with his disciples, asked them, saying, Who do people say*
- 19 *that I am? They answered, John the Baptist; others say, Elijah; and others, that one*

Mat. 16; 13.
Mar. 8; 27.

CH. 6.

SECT. VII.

20 of the ancient Prophets is risen again. *He said to them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answered,* The Messiah of God. *Then having strictly charged them, he prohibited them from*
 21 *telling this to any body, adding, The Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and rise again the third day.*

22 *Then he said to all the people, If any man will come under my guidance, let him renounce himself, and take his cross daily, and follow*
 23 *me. For whosoever would save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my*
 24 *sake, shall save it. What will it profit a man to gain the whole world, with the forfeit or*
 25 *ruin of himself? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him the Son of Man will be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in that of the Father, and of*
 26 *the holy messengers. I certify you, that there are some standing here, who shall not taste death until they see the reign of God.*

27 *ABOUT eight days after this discourse, he took with him Peter, and John, and James, and*
 28 *went up upon a mountain to pray. While he prayed, the appearance of his countenance was*
 29 *changed, and his raiment contracted a dazzling*
 30 *whiteness. And behold, two men of a glorious*
 31 *aspect, Moses and Elijah, conversed with him, and spoke of the departure which he was to ac-*
 32 *complish at Jerusalem. Now Peter, and those*

Mat. 10 ; 38.
 & 16 ; 24.
 Mar. 8 ; 34.
 ch. 14 ; 27.
 & 47 ; 33.
 Jo. 12 ; 25.
 Mat. 10 ; 33.
 2 Tim. 2 ; 12.

Mat. 17 ; 1.
 Mar. 9 ; 2.

SECT. VII.

CH. 9.

that were with him, were overpowered with sleep ; but when they awoke, they saw his glory,
 33 *and the two men who stood with him. As these were removing from Jesus, Peter said to him, not knowing what he said, Master, it is good for us to stay here : let us, then, make three booths, one for thee, one for Moses, and one*
 34 *for Elijah. While he was speaking, a cloud came and covered them, and the disciples feared*
 35 *when those men entered the cloud : from the cloud a voice came, which said, This is my be-*
 36 *loved Son, hear him. While the voice was uttered, Jesus was found alone. And this they kept secret, telling nobody, in those days, aught of what they had seen.*
 37 *The next day, when they were come down from the mountain, a great multitude met him.*
 38 *And one of the crowd cried out, saying, Rabbi, I beseech thee, take pity on my son ; for he is*
 39 *my only child. And lo a spirit seizeth him, making him instantly cry out, and fall into convulsions, so that he foameth ; and after he is*
 40 *much bruised, hardly leaveth him. And I besought thy disciples to expel the demon ; but*
 41 *they were not able. Then Jesus answering said, O incredulous and perverse generation ; how long shall I be with you, and suffer you ?*
 42 *Bring thy son hither. And as he was coming, the demon dashed him down in convulsions. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and having cured the child, delivered him to his father.*
 43 *And they were all amazed at the great power of God.*

Mat. 17 ; 14.
 Mar. 9 ; 14.

OH. 6.

SECT. VII.

While all were admiring every thing which Je-
 44 *sus did, he said to his disciples, Mark diligently*
 these words, 'The Son of Man is to be deliver-
 45 'ed into the hands of men.' *But they under-*
stood not this language; it was veiled to them,
that they might not apprehend it; and they were
afraid to ask him concerning it.

Mat. 17; 22.
 Mar. 9; 31.

Mat. 18; 1.
 Mar. 9; 33.

46 *And there arose a debate among them, which*
 47 *of them should be the greatest. But Jesus, who*
perceived the thought of their heart, took a child,
 48 *and placing him near himself, said to them, Who-*
 soever shall receive this child for my sake, re-
 ceiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me,
 receiveth him who sent me: for he who is least
 amongst you all shall be greatest.

Mar. 9; 38.

49 *Then John said, Master, we saw one expel-*
 ling demons in thy name, and we forbade him,
 50 because he consorteth not with us. *Jesus an-*
swered, forbid not such, for whoever is not
against us, is for us.

51 *Now as the time of his removal approached,*
he set out resolutely for Jerusalem, and sent
 52 *messengers before, who went into a village of*
the Samaritans to make preparation for him.
 53 *But they would not admit him, because they per-*
 54 *ceived he was going to Jerusalem. His disci-*
ples, James and John, observing this, said,
 Master, wilt thou that we call down fire from
 heaven to consume them, as Elijah did? *But*
 55 *he turned and rebuked them, saying, Ye know*
 56 *not what spirit ye are of; for the Son of Man*
 is come, not to destroy men, but to save them.
Then they went to another village.

2 Ki. 1; 9.
 Jo. 3; 17.

SECT. VII.

CH. 10.

- 57 *As they were on the way, one said to him,* Mat. 8; 19
 Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou
 58 goest. *Jesus answered,* The foxes have caverns,
 and the birds of the air have places of
 shelter, but the Son of Man hath not where to
 repose his head.
- 59 *He said to another,* Follow me. *He answered,* Mat. 8; 21
 Sir, permit me first to go and bury my father.
- 60 *Jesus replied,* Let the dead bury their dead,
 but go thou and publish the reign of God.
- 61 *Another likewise said,* I will follow thee, Sir,
 but first permit me to take leave of my family.
- 62 *Jesus answered,* No man who, having put his
 hand to the plough, looketh behind him, is fit
 for the kingdom of God.

- X. *AFTERWARDS* the Lord appointed sev-
 enty others also, and sent them two and two
 before him, into every city and place whither he
 2 intended to go. *And he said to them,* The har- Mar. 9; 37
 vest is plentiful, but the reapers are few: pray
 therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he
 3 would send labourers to reap it. Go then; Mat. 10; 16.
 behold I send you forth as lambs amongst Mat. 10; 9.
 4 wolves. Carry no purse, nor bag, nor shoes, Mar. 6; 8.
 5 and salute no person by the way. Whatever
 house ye enter, say, first, 'Peace be to this Mat. 10; 12
 6 'house.' And if a son of peace be there,
 your peace shall rest upon him; if not, it shall
 7 return upon yourselves. But remain in the
 same house, eating and drinking such things as
 it affordeth; for the workman is worthy of his 1 Tim. 5;
 8 wages: go not from house to house. And 18.

CH. 10.

SECT. VII.

- whatever city ye enter, if they receive you,
 9 eat such things as are set before you; cure
 their sick, and say to them, 'The reign of
 Acts, 13; 51. 10 'God cometh upon you.' But whatever city
 ye enter, if they do not receive you, go out
 11 into the streets, and say, 'The very dirt of
 'your streets, which cleaveth to us, we wipe
 'off against you; know, however, that the
 12 'reign of God cometh upon you.' I assure you,
 that the condition of Sodom shall be more tole-
 rable on that day, than the condition of that city.
 Mat. 11; 21. 13 Woe unto thee Chorazin, woe unto thee
 Bethsaida; for if the miracles which have been
 performed in you, had been performed in Tyre
 and Sidon, they had repented long ago, sitting
 14 in sackcloth and ashes. Wherefore the condi-
 tion of Tyre and Sidon shall be more tolerable
 15 in the judgment than yours. And thou Caperna-
 um, which hast been exalted to heaven, shalt
 Mat. 10; 40. 16 be thrown down to hades. He that heareth
 Jo. 13; 20. you, heareth me; and he that rejecteth you,
 rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me, reject-
 eth him who sent me.
 17 *And the seventy returned with joy, saying,*
 Master, even the demons are subject unto us,
 18 through thy name. *He said to them, I beheld*
 19 *Satan fall like lightning from heaven. Lo, I*
empower you to tread on serpents and scor-
pions, and all the might of the enemy; and
 20 *nothing shall hurt you. Nevertheless, rejoice*
not in this, that the spirits are subject unto
you; but rejoice that your names are enrolled
 Mat. 11; 25. 21 *in heaven. At that time Jesus was joyful in*
spirit, and said, I adore thee, O Father, Lord

SECT. VII.

CH. 10.

of heaven and earth, because having hidden these things from sages and the learned, thou hast revealed them unto babes. Yes, Father, 22 because such is thy pleasure. My Father hath Jo. 3; 35. 6; 46. & 10; 15. imparted every thing to me; and none knoweth who the Son is, except the Father; nor who the Father is, except the Son, and he to 23 whom the Son will reveal him. *Then turning, he said apart to his disciples,* Blessed are the 24 eyes which see what ye see. For I assure you, that many Prophets and kings have wished to see the things which ye see, but have not seen them, and to hear the things which ye hear, but have not heard them.

25 *THEN a lawyer stood up, and said, trying him, Rabbi, what must I do to obtain eternal* Mat. 22; 35. Mar. 12; 23. Deut. 6; 5. life? *Jesus said unto him, What doth the law* 26 *prescribe? What readest thou there? He answered,* “Thou shalt love the Lord⁴¹ thy God Lev. 19; 18. 27 “with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and “with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, 28 “and thy neighbour as thyself.” *Jesus replied,* Thou hast answered right. Do this, and thou shalt live.

29 *But he, desirous to appear blameless, said to* 30 *Jesus, Who is my neighbour? Jesus said in return,* A man of Jerusalem, travelling to Jericho, fell among robbers, who having stripped and wounded him, went away, leaving him half 31 dead. A priest accidentally going that way, and seeing him, passed by on the farther side.

⁴¹ Jehovah.

CH. 10.

SECT. VII.

32 Likewise a Levite on the road, when he came
 near the place and saw him, passed by on the
 33 farther side. But a certain Samaritan, as he
 journeyed, came where he was, and when he
 34 saw him, he had compassion, and went up to
 him, and having poured wine and oil into his
 wounds, he bound them up. Then he set him
 on his own beast, brought him to an inn, and
 35 took care of him. On the morrow, when he
 was going away, he took out two denarii⁴², and
 giving them to the host, said, 'Take care of
 'this man, and whatever thou spendest more,
 36 'when I return, I will repay thee.' Now
 which of these three, thinkest thou, was neigh-
 37 bour to him who fell among the robbers? *The*
lawyer answered, He who took pity upon him.
Then said Jesus, Go thou, and do in like man-
 ner.

38 *AND as they travelled, he went into a vil-*
*lage*⁴³, *where a woman named Martha enter-*
 39 *tained him at her house. She had a sister*
called Mary, who sat at the feet of Jesus, listen-
 40 *ing to his discourse: But Martha, who was*
much cumbered about serving, came to him and
said, Master, carest thou not that my sister
 leaveth me to serve alone? Bid her, therefore,
 41 assist me. *Jesus answering, said unto her,*
 Martha, Martha, thou art anxious, and troublest
 42 thyself about many things. One thing only
 is necessary. And Mary hath chosen the good
 part which shall not be taken from her.

⁴² About 1s. 3d. sterling.⁴³ To wit *Bethany*.

SECTION VIII.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PHARISEES.

- XI. *IT* happened that Jesus was praying in a certain place ; and when he had done, one of his disciples said to him, Master, teach us to pray, 2 as John also taught his disciples. *He answered,* When ye pray, say, ' Our¹ Father, ' who ' art in heaven,¹ thy name be hallowed ; thy ' reign come ; ' thy will be done upon the 3 ' earth, as it is in heaven ;¹ give us each day 4 ' our daily bread ; and forgive us our sins, for ' even we forgive all who offend us ; and abandon us not to temptation, ' but preserve us ' from evil.'¹ Mat. 6 ; 9.
- 5 *Moreover, he said unto them,* Should one of you have a friend, and go to him at midnight, 6 and say, ' Friend, lend me three loaves ; for a ' friend of mine is come off his road to see me, 7 ' and I have nothing to set before him ;' and he from within should answer, ' Do not disturb me ; the door is now locked ; I and my ' children are in bed ; I cannot rise to give 8 ' thee :' I tell you, ' if the other continue knocking, ' though he will not rise and supply him, because he is his friend ; he will, because of

CH. 11.

SECT. VIII.

Mat. 7 ; 7-
& 21 ; 22.
Mar. 11 ; 24.
Jo. 16 ; 24.
Ja. 1 ; 5.

his importunity, get up, and give him as many
9 as he wanteth. I likewise tell you, Ask, and
ye shall obtain ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock,
10 and the door shall be opened to you : for who-
soever asketh, obtaineth ; whosoever seeketh,
findeth ; and to every one who knocketh, the
11 door is opened. What father amongst you
would give his son a stone, when he asketh
bread ; or when he asketh a fish, would, instead
12 of a fish, give him a serpent ; or when he ask-
13 eth an egg, would give him a scorpion ? If ye,
therefore, bad as ye are, can give good things
to your children ; how much more will your
Father give from heaven the Holy Spirit to
them that ask him ?

Mat. 9 ; 32.
& 12 ; 22.

Mar. 3 ; 22.

14 *ONE* time he was expelling a demon which
caused dumbness, and when the demon was gone
out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered.
15 *Some* however said, He expelleth demons by
16 Beelzebub prince of the demons. (*Others to try*
17 *him, asked of him a sign in the sky.*) *But he*
knowing their thoughts, said to them, By intes-
tine broils any kingdom may be desolated, one
18 family falling after another. Now, if there be
intestine broils in the kingdom of Satan, how
can that kingdom subsist ? for ye say that I
19 expel demons by Beelzebub. Moreover, if I
by Beelzebub expel demons, by whom do your
sons expel them ? Wherefore they shall be
20 your judges. But if I by the finger of God
expel demons, the reign of God hath overtaken
21 you. When the strong one armed guardeth

SECT. VIII.

CH. 11.

- 22 his palace, his effects are secure. But, if he
 who is stronger, shall attack and overcome
 him, he will strip him of his armour on which
 23 he relied, and dispose of his spoils. He who
 is not for me, is against me; and he who gath-
 ereth not with me, scattereth.
- 24 The unclean spirit, when he is gone out of a Mat. 12; 43.
 man, wandereth over parched deserts, in search
 of a resting-place. But not finding any, he
 saith, 'I will return to my house whence I
 25 'came.' Being come, he findeth it swept and
 26 furnished. Whereupon he goeth, and bringeth
 seven other spirits more wicked than himself;
 and having entered, they dwell there, and the
 last state of that man becometh worse than the 2 Pet. 2; 20.
 Heb. 6; 4.
 & 10; 26.
 first.
- 27 *While he was saying these things, a woman*
raising her voice, cried to him from amid the
crowd, Happy the womb which bore thee, and
 28 *the breasts which suckled thee. Say, rather,*
replied he, Happy they who hear the word of
God and obey it.
- 29 *When the people crowded together, he said,* Mat. 12; 38;
 & 16; 4.
 This is an evil generation. They demand a
 sign; but no sign shall be given them, save the
 30 sign of the Prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was
 a sign to the Ninevites, so shall the Son of
 31 Man be to this generation. The queen of the 1 Ki. 10; 1.
 2 Chr. 9; 1.
 South⁴⁴ country will arise in the judgment
 against the men of this generation, and cause
 them to be condemned; because she came
 from the extremities of the earth to hear the

⁴⁴ In the Old Testament *Sheba*.

CH. 11.

SECT. VIII.

- wise discourses of Solomon; and behold, here
 Jon. 3; 5. 32 is something greater than Solomon. The men
 of Nineveh will stand up in the judgment
 against this generation, and caused it to be con-
 demned; because they repented when warned
 by Jonah; and behold here is something great-
 er than Jonah.
- Mat. 5; 15. 33 A lamp is lighted, not to be concealed, or put
 Mar. 4; 21. under a corn-measure, but on a stand, that
 Mat. 6; 22. 34 they who enter may have light. The lamp of
 the body is the eye: when, therefore, thine eye
 is sound, thy whole body is enlightened; but
 when thine eye is distempered, thy body is in
 35 darkness. Take heed, then, lest the light
 36 which is in thee be darkness. If thy whole
 body, therefore, be enlightened, having no part
 dark, the whole will be so enlightened, as when
 a lamp lighteth thee by its flame.
- 37 *While he was speaking, a Pharisee asked*
him to dine with him. And he went and placed
 38 *himself at table. But the Pharisee was sur-*
prised to observe, that he used no washing be-
 39 *fore dinner. Then the Lord said to him, As*
 Mat. 23; 25. *for you Pharisees, ye cleanse the outside of*
your cups and dishes, while ye yourselves are
 40 *inwardly full of rapacity and malevolence. Un-*
thinking men! did not he who made the out-
 41 *side, make the inside also? Only give in alms*
what ye have, and all things shall be clean
unto you.
- Mat. 23; 23. 42 Woe unto you, Pharisees, because ye pay
 the tithe of mint and rue, and every kind of
 herb, and neglect justice and the love of God.

SECT. VIII.

CH. 11.

These things ye ought to have practised, and not to have omitted those.

43 Woe unto you, pharisees, because ye love Mat. 23 ; 6. the most conspicuous seat in synagogues, and salutations in public places.

44 Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, because ye are like concealed graves, over which people walk without knowing it.

45 *Here one of the lawyers interposing, said,* By speaking thus, Rabbi, thou reproachest us
46 also. *He answered,* Woe unto you, lawyers, Mat. 23 ; 4. also, because ye lade men with intolerable burdens, burdens which ye yourselves will not so much as touch with one of your fingers.

47 Woe unto you, because ye build the monuments of the Prophets, whom your fathers Mat. 23 ; 9.
48 killed. Surely ye are both vouchers and accessories to the deeds of your fathers; for they killed them, and ye build their monuments.

49 Wherefore, thus saith the wisdom of God, Mat. 23 ; 34.
‘ I will send them Prophets and Apostles ;
‘ some of them they will kill, others they will
50 ‘ banish ; insomuch that the blood of all the
‘ Prophets which hath been shed since the
‘ formation of the world, shall be required of
51 ‘ this generation, from the blood of Abel to the Gen. 4 ; 8.
‘ blood of Zechariah, who fell between the 2 Chr. 24 ;
‘ altar and the house of God.’ Yes, I assure 20.
you, all shall be required of this generation.

52 Woe unto you, lawyers, because ye have Mat. 23 ; 13. carried off the key of knowledge : ye have not

entered yourselves, and those who were entering, ye hindered.

- 53 *While he spake these things, the scribes and the pharisees began vehemently to press him*
 54 *with questions on many points; laying snares for him, in order to draw from his own mouth matter of accusation against him.*

- XII. *MEANTIME*, while the crowd in myriads flocked about him, insomuch that they trod one upon another, he said, addressing himself to his disciples, Above all things, beware of the leaven of the pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For there is nothing covered that shall not be detected; nothing secret that shall not be known.
- 3 What ye have spoken in the dark, shall be reported in the light; and what ye have whispered in the closet, shall be proclaimed from
 4 the house-top. But I charge you, my friends, fear not them who kill the body, and after that
 5 can do no more: but I will show you whom ye ought to fear; fear him who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell. I repeat
 6 it to you, fear him. Are not five sparrows sold for two pence⁴⁵? Yet not one of them is
 7 forgotten of God: yea, the very hairs of your head are all numbered: fear not, therefore; ye are much more valuable than sparrows.
- 8 Moreover, I say unto you, whoever shall acknowledge me before men, him the Son of

Mat. 16; 6.
 Mar. 8; 15.

Mat. 10; 26.
 Mar. 4; 22.

⁴⁵ Value three-halfpence of our money.

- Man will acknowledge before the angels of
 9 God; but whoever denieth me before men, Mar. 8; 38.
2 Ti. 2; 12.
 shall be disowned before the angels of God. Mat. 12; 32.
Mar. 3; 28.
- 10 And whoso shall inveigh against the Son of 1 Jo. 5; 16.
 Man, may obtain remission; but to him who
 detracteth from the Holy Spirit, there is no
 11 remission. And when ye are brought before Mat. 10; 19.
Mar. 13; 11.
 synagogues, and magistrates, and rulers, be
 not solicitous, how or what ye shall answer, or
 12 what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit will
 teach you in that moment what ought to be
 said.
- 13 *Then one said to him out of the crowd, Rabbi,*
 order my brother to divide the inheritance
 14 with me. *He answered, Man, who constituted*
 15 *me your judge or arbiter? And he said to*
them, Be upon your guard against covetous-
ness; for in whatever affluence a man be, his
life dependeth not on his possessions.
- 16 *He also used this example, A certain rich*
 man had lands which brought forth plentifully.
 17 And he reasoned thus with himself, What shall
 I do; for I have not where to store up my
 18 crop?—I will do this, added he, I will pull Ecclus. 11;
19.
 down my barns, and build larger, and there I
 will store up all my product and my goods.
- 19 And I will say to my soul, ‘Soul, thou hast
 ‘plenty of goods laid up for many years; take
 20 ‘thine ease, eat, drink, enjoy thyself.’ But
 God said to him, ‘Thou fool, this very night
 ‘thy soul is required of thee. Whose, then,
 ‘shall those things be which thou hast pro-

21 ' vided ?' So it fareth with him who amasses treasure for himself, but is not rich towards God.

22 *Then he said to his disciples,* For this reason I charge you, be not anxious about your life, what ye shall eat ; nor about your body, what
 23 ye shall wear. Life is a greater gift than food,
 24 and the body than raiment. Consider the ravens ; they neither sow nor reap ; have neither cellar nor barn ; but God feedeth them. How much more valuable are ye than the
 25 fowls ? Besides, which of you can, by his anxiety, prolong his life one hour ? If, therefore,
 26 ye cannot thus effect even the smallest thing,
 27 why are ye anxious about the rest ? Consider the lilies. How do they grow ? They toil not ; they spin not ; yet I affirm, that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not equally
 28 adorned with one of these. If, then, God so array the herbage, which to-day is in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven ; how much more will he array you, O ye distrust-
 29 ful ? Ask not ye, therefore, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink ; live not in anxious
 30 suspense. For all these things the Pagans seek ; whereas your Father knoweth that ye
 31 need them. But seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be superadded to you.
 32 Fear not, my little flock, for it hath pleased
 33 your Father to give you the kingdom. Sell your goods and give alms ; provide yourselves purses which wear not out ; treasure inexhaustible in heaven, where no thieves approach,

Mat. 6 ; 25.
 Ps. 55 ; 22.
 1 Pet. 5 ; 7.

Mat. 6 ; 20.
 19 ; 21.

SECT. VIII.

CH. 12.

34 where nothing is spoiled by worms. For
where your treasure is, your heart will like-
wise be.

35 Let your loins be girt, and your lamps burn- 1 Pet. 1; 13.
36 ing; and yourselves like those who wait their
master's return from the wedding; that when
he cometh and knocketh, they may immediate-
37 ly let him in. Happy those servants whom
their master, at his return, shall find watching.
Verily I say unto you, that he will gird him-
self, and having placed them at table, will at-
38 tend and serve them. And whether he come
in the second watch, or in the third; if he find
39 things thus, happy are those servants. Ye are Mat. 24; 43-
1 Th. 5; 2.
Rev. 3; 3. &
16; 15.
certain, that if the master of the house knew at
what hour the thief would come, he would
watch, and not allow him to break into his
40 house. Be ye then always prepared; because
the Son of Man will come at an hour when ye
are not expecting him.

41 *Then Peter said to him, Master, is this com-*
parison directed to us alone, or to all present?
42 *The Lord said, Who now is the discreet and*
faithful steward, whom the master will set over
his household, to dispense regularly the allow-
43 *ance of corn? Happy that servant, if his mas-*
ter at his arrival, shall find him so employed.
44 I tell you truly, he will entrust him with the
45 management of all his estate. But as to the
servant who shall say within himself, 'My
'master delayeth his return,' and shall beat the
men-servants and the maids, and shall feast and
46 carouse, and be drunken; the master of that

servant will come on a day when he is not expecting him, and at an hour he is not apprized of, and having discarded him, will assign him
 47 his portion with the faithless. And that servant who knew his master's will, yet did not make himself ready, nor execute his orders,
 48 shall receive many stripes; whereas he who knew it not, but did things deserving chastisement, shall receive few: for much will be required of every one to whom much is given; and the more a man is entrusted with, the more will be exacted from him.

49 I came to throw fire upon the earth; and
 50 what would I, but that it were kindled? I have an immersion to undergo; and how am I
 51 pained till it be accomplished? Do ye imagine that I am come to give peace to the earth? I
 52 tell you, No, but division. For hereafter five in one family will be divided; three against
 53 two, and two against three; father against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against mother; mother-in-law against daughter-in-law, and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law.

54 *He said also to the people,* When ye see a cloud rising in the west, ye say, 'It will rain
 55 'immediately,' and so it happeneth: and when the south wind bloweth, ye say, 'It will be hot,'
 56 and it happeneth accordingly. Hypocrites, ye can judge of what appeareth in the sky, and on the earth; how is it that ye cannot judge of
 57 the present time? and why do ye not even of yourselves discern what is just?

Ja. 4; 17.

Mat. 10; 34.

Mat. 16; 2.

SECT. IX.

CH. 13.

58 When thou goest with thy creditor to the
 magistrate, endeavour on the road to satisfy
 him, lest he drag thee before the judge, and
 the judge consign thee to the sergent, and the
 59 sergent commit thee to prison : I assure thee,
 thou wilt not be released, until thou has paid
 the last mite.

 SECTION IX.

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM.

XIII. *THERE* were then present some who informed Jesus of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with that of their sacrifices.

2 Jesus answering, said unto them, Think ye that these Galileans were the greatest sinners in all

3 Galilee, because they suffered such usage ? I tell you, ' No ; but unless ye reform, ye shall

4 ' all likewise perish : ' or those eighteen whom the tower of Siloam fell upon, and slew ; think ye that they were the greatest profligates in

5 all Jerusalem ? I tell you, No : but unless ye reform, ye also shall all perish.

6 *He also spake this parable.* A man had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard, and came seek-

7 ing fruit on it, but found none. Then he said to the vine-dresser, ' This is the third year ' that I have come seeking fruit on this fig-

CH. 13.

SECT. IX.

‘ tree, without finding any. Cut it down, why
8 ‘ should it cumber the ground?’ He answered,
‘ Sir, let it alone one year longer, until I dig
9 ‘ about it and dung it; perhaps it will bear
‘ fruit: if not, thou mayest afterwards cut it
‘ down.’

10 *ONE sabbath, as he was teaching in a syna-*
11 *gogue, a woman was present who had for*
eighteen years had a spirit of infirmity, whereby
she was so bowed down, that she could not so
12 *much as look up. Jesus, perceiving her, called*
13 *her to him, and laying his hands on her, said,*
Woman, thou art delivered from thine infirmity.
Immediately she stood upright, and glorified
14 *God. But the director of the synagogue, mov-*
ed with indignation because Jesus had performed
a cure on the Sabbath, said to the people, There
are six days for working; come, therefore, on
those days, and be healed, and not on the Sab-
15 *bath-day. To which the Lord replied, Hypo-*
crites, who is there amongst you, that doth not
on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the
16 *stall, and lead him away to watering? And*
must not this woman, a daughter of Abraham,
whom Satan hath kept bound, lo, these eighteen
years, be released from this bond on the Sab-
17 *bath-day? On his saying this, all his opposers*
were ashamed; but the whole multitude was
delighted with all the glorious actions perform-
ed by him.

Mat. 13; 31.
Mar. 4; 31.

18 *He said, moreover, What doth the kingdom*
of God resemble? Whereunto shall I compare

SECT. IX.

CH. 13.

- 19 it? It resembleth a grain of mustard seed, which a man threw into his garden; and it grew and became a great tree, and the birds of the air took shelter in its branches.
- 20 *Again he said,* Whereunto shall I compare Mat. 13; 33.
- 21 the kingdom of God? It resembleth leaven which a woman mingled in three measures of meal, until the whole was leavened.
- 22 *And he took a journey to Jerusalem, teaching* Mat. 9; 35.
- 23 *as he passed through cities and villages; and one asked him,* Master, are there but few who
- 24 shall be saved? *He answered,* Force your entrance through the strait gate; for many, I assure you, will request to be admitted, who shall
- 25 not prevail. If once the master of the house Mat. 25; 10.
- shall have arisen and locked the door, and ye standing without and knocking, say, 'Master, 'master, open unto us,' he will answer, 'I know
- 26 'not whence ye are.' Then ye will say, 'We 'have eaten and drunk with thee, and thou
- 27 'hast taught in our streets.' But he will answer, 'I tell you, I know not whence ye are: Mat. 7; 23. & 25; 41.
- 'remove hence, all ye workers of unrighteous-
- 28 'ness.' Then will ensue weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, received into the kingdom of God, and yourselves ex-
- 29 cluded: nay, people will come from the east, from the west, from the north, and from the south, and will place themselves at table in the
- 30 kingdom of God. And behold they are last Mat. 19; 30. Mar. 10; 31.
- who shall be first, and they are first who shall be last.

CH. 14.

SECT. IX.

31 *The same day certain Pharisees came to him, and said, Get away ; depart hence, for Herod*
 32 *intendeth to kill thee. He answered, Go tell that fox, To-day and to-morrow I expel de-*
 33 *mons and perform cures, and the third day my*
 34 *course will be completed. Nevertheless I*
 35 *must walk about to-day and to-morrow, and the day following ; for it cannot be that a prophet should be cut off any where but at Jeru-*
 Mat. 23 ; 37. 34 *salem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them whom God sendeth to thee ; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, but ye would not.*
 35 *Quickly shall your habitation be transformed into a desert ; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not again see me, until the time when ye shall say, " Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord⁴⁶."*

XIV. *IT happened on a Sabbath, when he was gone to eat at the house of one of the rulers who was a Pharisee, that, while the Pharisees were observing him, a man who had a dropsy stood*
 2 *before him. Then Jesus, addressing himself to the lawyers and Pharisees, said, Is it lawful to*
 4 *cure on the Sabbath ? They being silent, he took hold of the man, healed and dismissed him.*
 5 *Then resuming his discourse, he said to them, Who amongst you, if his ass or his ox fall into*

⁴⁶ Jehovah.

SECT. IX.

CH. 14.

a pit on the Sabbath-day, will not immediately
6 pull him out? *And to this they were not able to
make him a reply.*

7 *Observing how eager the guests were to possess the higher places at table, he gave them*
8 *this injunction, When thou art invited to a wedding, do not occupy the highest place at table, lest one more considerable than thou be bid-*
9 *den, and he who invited you both come and say to thee, Give place to this man, and thou shouldst then rise with confusion to take the*
10 *lowest place. But, when thou art invited, go* Prov. 25; 7.
to the lowest place, that when he who bade thee cometh, he may say to thee, 'Friend, go
' up higher;' for that will do thee honour be-
11 *fore the company. For whoever exalteth himself, shall be humbled; and whoever humbleth himself, shall be exalted.* ch. 13; 14.
Mat. 23; 12.

12 *He said also to him who had invited him, When thou givest a dinner or a supper, do not invite thy rich friends, brothers, cousins, or neighbours, lest they also invite thee in their*
13 *turn, and thou be recompensed. But when thou givest an entertainment, invite the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be*
14 *happy: for as they have not wherewith to requite thee, thou shalt be requited at the resurrection of the righteous.*

15 *One of the guests hearing this said to him, Happy he who shall feast in the reign of God.*
16 *Jesus said to him, A certain man made a great* Mat. 22; 2.
Rev. 19; 9.
17 *supper and invited many. And at supper-time he sent his servants to tell those who had been bidden to come presently; for that all*

18 was ready. But they all, without exception, made excuses. One said, 'I have purchased a field, which I must go and see; I pray thee
 19 'have me excused.' Another said, 'I have bought five yoke of oxen, which I am going
 20 'to prove; I pray thee, have me excused.' A third said, 'I have married a wife, and there-
 21 'fore I cannot go.' The servant, being returned, related all to his master. Then the master of the house was angry, and said to his servants, 'Go forthwith into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, the
 22 'maimed, the lame, and the blind.' Afterwards the servant said, 'Sir, thy orders are executed,
 23 'and still there is room.' The master answered, 'Go out into the highways, and along the hedges, and compel people to come, that my
 24 'house may be filled: for I declare to you, that none of those who were invited shall taste of my supper.'

Mat. 10; 37.
 & 16; 24.
 Mar 8; 34.

25 *As great multitudes travelled along with him,*
 26 *he turned to them and said,* If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters; nay, and himself too, he cannot be my disciple.
 27 And whosoever doth not follow me carrying
 28 his cross, cannot be my disciple. For, which of you intending to build a tower, doth not first by himself compute the expense, to know whether he have wherewith to complete it;
 29 lest, having laid the foundation, and being unable to finish, he become the derision of all who
 30 see it, who will say, 'This man began to build,

SECT. X.

CH. 15.

31 'but was not able to finish.' Or what king
 going to engage another king with whom he is
 at war, doth not first consult by himself, whe-
 ther he can with ten thousand men, encounter
 him who cometh against him with twenty
 32 thousand; that, if he cannot, he may, while the
 other is at a distance, send an embassy to sue
 33 for peace. So then, whosoever he be of you,
 who doth not renounce all that he hath, he can-
 34 not be my disciple. Salt is good; but if the Mat. 5; 13.
 salt become insipid, wherewith shall it be sea- Mar. 9; 50.
 soned? It is fit, neither for the land, nor for
 the dunghill, but is thrown away. Whoso
 hath ears to hear, let him hear.

SECTION X.

PARABLES.

XV. *NOW all the publicans and the sinners re-*
 2 *sorted to Jesus to hear him. But the Pharisees*
and the scribes murmured, saying, This man
admitteth sinners, and eateth with them.
 3 *Then he addressed this similitude to them:* Mat. 18; 12.
 4 What man amongst you, who hath a hundred
 sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave
 the ninety-nine in the desert, to go after that
 5 which is lost, until he find it? And having
 found it, doth he not joyfully lay it on his should-

6 ers, and, when he is come home, convene his friends and neighbours, saying to them, ‘ Re-
 ‘ joice with me, for I have found my sheep
 7 ‘ which was lost?’ Thus, I assure you, there is greater joy in heaven for one sinner who reformeth, than for ninety-nine righteous persons who need no reformation.

8 Or what woman, who hath ten drachmas⁴⁷, if she lose one, doth not light a lamp, and sweep the house, and search carefully, until she find it?

9 And having found it, doth she not assemble her female friends and neighbours, saying, ‘ Rejoice
 ‘ with me, for I have found the drachma which
 10 ‘ I had lost.’ Such joy, I assure you, have the angels of God, when any one sinner reformeth.

11 *He said also,* A certain man had two sons.
 12 And the younger of them said to his father,
 ‘ Father, give me my portion of the estate.’
 13 And he allotted to them their shares. Soon after, the younger son gathered all together, and travelled into a distant country, and there
 14 wasted his substance in riot. When all was spent, a great famine came upon that land, and
 15 he began to be in want. Then he applied to one of the inhabitants of that country, who sent
 16 him into his fields to keep swine. And he was fain to fill his belly with the husks on which the swine were feeding; for nobody
 17 gave him aught. At length, coming to himself, he said, ‘ How many hirelings hath my
 ‘ father, who have all more bread than sufficeth

⁴⁷ About 6s. 3d. sterling.

SECT. X.

CH. 15.

18 ' them, while I perish with hunger! I will arise
' and go to my father, and will say unto him,
' Father, I have sinned against heaven and
19 ' thee, and am no longer worthy to be called
' thy son; make me as one of thy hirelings.'

20 And he arose and went to his father. When
he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and had
compassion, and ran, and threw himself upon
21 his neck, and kissed him. And the son said,
' Father, I have sinned against heaven and
' thee, and am no longer worthy to be called
22 ' thy son.' But the father said to his servants,
' Bring hither the principal robe and put it on
' him, and put a ring on his finger, and shoes
23 ' on his feet: bring also the fatted calf and kill
24 ' it, and let us eat and be merry; for this my
' son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost,
' and is found.' So they began to be merry.

25 Now his elder son was in the field walk-
ing home. And as he drew near the house, he
26 heard music and dancing. He, therefore, called
one of the servants, and asked the reason of
27 this. He answered, ' Thy brother is returned,
' and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, be-
28 ' cause he hath received him in health.' And
he was angry, and would not go in; therefore
29 his father came out and entreated him. He an-
swering, said to his father, ' These many years
' I have served thee, without disobeying thy
' command in any thing; yet thou never gavest
' me a kid that I might entertain my friends;
30 ' but no sooner did this thy son return, who
' hath squandered thy living on prostitutes,

‘ than thou killedst for him the fatted calf.’
 31 ‘ Son,’ replied the father, ‘ thou art always with
 ‘ me, and all that I have is thine: it was but
 32 ‘ reasonable that we should rejoice and be
 ‘ merry; because this thy brother was dead,
 ‘ and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.’

XVI. *HE said likewise to his disciples,* A certain rich man had a steward, who was accused to
 2 him of wasting his estate. Having, therefore, called him, he said, ‘ What is this that I hear of
 ‘ thee? Render an account of thy management,
 3 ‘ for thou shalt be steward no longer.’ And the steward said within himself, ‘ What shall I
 ‘ do? My master taketh from me the steward-
 ‘ ship; I cannot dig, and am ashamed to beg.
 4 ‘ I am resolved what to do, that when I am dis-
 ‘ carded, there may be some who will receive
 5 ‘ me into their houses.’ Having therefore sent severally for all his master’s debtors, he asked
 one, ‘ How much owest thou to my master?’
 6 He answered, ‘ A hundred baths of oil⁴⁸.’ ‘ Take
 ‘ back thy bill,’ said the steward, ‘ sit down di-
 7 ‘ rectly, and write one for fifty.’ Then he asked another, ‘ How much owest thou?’ He
 answered, ‘ A hundred homers⁴⁹ of wheat.’
 ‘ Take back thy bill,’ said he, ‘ and write one for
 8 ‘ eighty.’ The master commended the prudence of the unjust steward; for the children

⁴⁸ *A bath* thought equal to 7 1-half English gallons.

⁴⁹ *A homer* to 75 1-half gallons.

SECT. X.

CH. 16.

of this world are more prudent in conducting
9 their affairs than the children of light. There-
fore I say unto you, With the deceitful mam-
mon procure to yourselves friends, who, after
your discharge, may receive you into the eter-
nal mansions.

10 Whoso is faithful in little, is faithful also in
much: and whoso is unjust in little, is unjust
11 also in much. If therefore ye have not been
honest in the deceitful, who will intrust you
12 with the true riches? And if ye have been
unfaithful managers for another, who will give
13 you any thing to manage for yourselves? Mat. 6; 24. A
servant cannot serve two masters; for either
he will hate one, and love the other, or at least
will attend one, and neglect the other. Ye
cannot serve God and mammon.

14 *When the Pharisees, who loved money, heard*
15 *all these things they ridiculed him. But he*
said unto them, As for you, ye make yourselves
pass upon men for righteous, but God knoweth
your hearts; for that which is admired by men,
is abhorred of God.

16 Ye had the law and the Prophets until the Mat. 11; 12.
coming of John, since whose time the kingdom
of God is announced, and every occupant en-
17 tereth it by force. But sooner shall heaven Mat. 5; 18.
and earth perish, than one tittle of the law
shall fail.

18 Whoever divorceth his wife, and taketh Mat. 5; 32.
another, committeth adultery; and whoever Mar. 10; 11.
marrieth the divorced woman, committeth
adultery.

CH. 16.

SECT. X.

19 There was a certain rich man, that wore
purple and fine linen, and feasted splendidly
20 every day. There was also a poor man named
Lazarus, covered with sores, that was laid at
21 his gate ; and was fain to feed on the crumbs
which fell from the rich man's table : yea, even
22 the dogs came and licked his sores. It hap-
pened that the poor man died, and was con-
veyed by angels to Abraham's bosom : the
23 rich man also died, and was buried. And in
hades, being in torments, he looked up, and saw
Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom,
24 and cried, saying, ' Have pity on me, father
' Abraham, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of
' his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I
25 ' am tortured in this flame.' Abraham answer-
ed, ' Son, remember that thou, in thy life-time,
' receivedst good things, and Lazarus received
' evil things ; but now, he is in joy, and thou
26 ' art in torments. Besides, there lieth a huge
' gulph betwixt us and you, so that they who
' would pass hence to you, cannot ; neither can
27 ' they pass to us who would come thence.' The
other replied, ' I entreat thee, then, father, to
28 ' send him to my father's house ; for I have five
' brothers, that he may admonish them, lest
' they also come into this place of torment.'
29 Abraham answered, ' They have Moses and
30 ' the Prophets, let them hear them.' ' Nay,'
said he, ' father Abraham, but if one went to
' them from the dead, they would reform.'
31 Abraham replied, ' If they hear not Moses and
' the Prophets ; neither will they be persuaded,
' though one should arise from the dead.'

SECTION XI.

INSTRUCTIONS AND WARNINGS.

- XVII. *THEN* Jesus said to his disciples, It is impossible to exclude snares entirely; but woe
 2 unto him who ensnareth. It would be more
 eligible for him to have an upper millstone fastened to his neck, and to be cast into the sea, than to insnare any of these little ones.
- 3 Take heed to yourselves; if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he
 4 repent, forgive him; and if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day return [to thee,] saying, 'I repent,' thou shalt forgive him.
- 5 *Then the Apostles said to the Lord,* Increase
 6 our faith. *He answered,* If ye had faith, though it were but as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say to this sycamine, 'Be extirpated and planted in the sea,' and it would obey you.
- 7 Would any of you, who hath a servant plowing or feeding cattle, say to him, on his return from the field, 'Come immediately, and place
 8 'thyself at table;' and not rather, 'Make ready 'my supper; gird thyself, and serve me, until

Mat. 18; 7.
 Mat. 18; 6.
 Mar. 9; 42.

Mat. 18; 21.
 Ecclus. 19;
 13.

Mat. 17; 20.

CH. 17.

SECT. XI.

‘ I have eaten and drunken ; afterwards thou
 9 ‘ mayest eat and drink ?’ Is he obliged to that
 servant for obeying his orders ? I suppose not.
 10 In like manner say ye, when ye have done all
 that is commanded you, ‘ We thy servants have
 ‘ conferred no favour ; we have done only
 ‘ what we were bound to do.’

11 *NOW, in travelling to Jerusalem, he passed
 through the confines of Samaria and Galilee,
 12 and being about to enter a certain village, there
 13 met him ten lepers, who stood at a distance, and
 cried out, Jesus, Master, take pity upon us.*

Lev. 14; 2

14 *When he saw them, he said to them, Go, show
 yourselves to the priests. And as they went,
 15 they were cleansed. And one of them perceiving
 that he was healed, turned back, glorifying God
 16 aloud. Then throwing himself prostrate at the
 feet of Jesus, he returned him thanks ; now this
 17 man was a Samaritan. Jesus said, Were not
 ten cleansed ? Where then are the other nine ?
 18 Have none returned glory to God, except this
 19 alien ? And he said to him, Arise, go thy way,
 thy faith hath cured thee.*

20 *Being questioned by the Pharisees when the
 reign of God should commence, he answered,
 The reign of God is not ushered in with pa-
 21 rade ; nor shall people say, ‘ Lo here !’ or
 ‘ Lo yonder !’ for behold the reign of God is
 within you.*

22 *Then he said to his disciples, The time will
 come when ye shall desire to see one of the
 days of the son of Man, and shall not see it.*

SECT. IV.

CH. 17.

- 23 But when they say to you, 'Lo here,' or 'Lo Mat. 24 ; 23.
Mar. 13 ; 21.
- 24 'yonder,' go not out to follow them. For as the lightning flasheth in an instant from one extremity of the sky to the other, so will the appearance of the Son of man be in his day.
- 25 But first he must suffer much, and be rejected
- 26 of this generation. And, as it happened in Mat. 24 ; 37.
Noah's days, it will also happen in the days of
- 27 the Son of Man. They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the ark, when the de-
- 28 luge came and destroyed them all. In like manner, as it was in the days of Lot, they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they plant-
- 29 ed, they built; but on the day that Lot left Gen. 19 ; 24.
Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heav-
- 30 en, which destroyed them all. So will it also be on the day when the Son of Man shall appear.
- 31 On that day let not him who shall be on the house-top, having his furniture in the house, come down to take it away. Let not him who
- 32 shall be in the field, return home. Remember Mat. 10 ; 39.
& 16 ; 25.
- 33 Lot's wife. Whosoever shall seek to save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever shall throw it Mar. 8 ; 35.
ch. 9 ; 24.
Jo. 12 ; 25.
- 34 away, shall preserve it. I tell you, there will be two men that night in one bed; one will be
- 35 seized, and the other will escape. Two women Mat. 24 ; 40.
will be grinding together; one will be seized,
- 36 and the other will escape. [Two men will be in the field; one will be seized, and the other
- 37 will escape.] *Then they asked him, Where, Master? He answered, Where the body is, the* Mat. 24 ; 28.
eagles will be assembled.

1 Th. 5; 17. XVIII. *He also showed them by a parable, that they ought to persist in prayer without growing*
 2 *weary.* In a certain city, *said he*, there was a
 judge, who neither feared God, nor regarded
 3 man. And there was a widow in that city who
 came to him, saying, ‘Do me justice on my ad-
 4 ‘versary.’ For some time he refused: but
 afterwards he argued thus with himself, ‘Al-
 ‘though I neither fear God, nor regard man;
 5 ‘yet because this widow importuneth me, I
 ‘will judge her cause, lest she come perpetual-
 6 ‘ly and plague me.’ Mark, *said the Lord*, what
 7 the unjust judge determined. And will not
 God avenge his elect, who cry to him day and
 8 night? Will he linger in their cause? I assure
 you, he will suddenly avenge them. Never-
 theless, when the Son of Man cometh, will he
 find this belief in the land?

9 *Then addressing some who were conceited of themselves as being righteous, and despised oth-*
 10 *ers, he proposed this example:* Two men went
 up to the temple to pray; one a Pharisee, the
 11 other a publican. The Pharisee standing by
 himself, prayed thus: ‘O God, I thank thee
 ‘that I am not as other men, extortioners, un-
 12 ‘just, adulterers, or even as this publican. I
 ‘fast twice a week. I give tithes of all that I
 13 ‘possess.’ But the publican standing at a dis-
 tance, and not daring so much as to lift up his
 eyes to heaven, smote upon his breast, and
 14 cried, ‘God be merciful to me a sinner.’ I as-
 sure you that this man returned home, more
 approved than the other: for whoever exalteth

himself, shall be humbled; but whoever humbleth himself, shall be exalted.

15 *Then they presented babes to him, that he might touch them: the disciples observing it,* Mat. 19; 13.
Mar. 10; 13.

16 *rebuked [those who brought] them. But Jesus calling them to him, said, Permit the children to come unto me, and do not forbid them; for*
17 *of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child, shall never enter it.*

18 *THEN a certain ruler asked him, saying,* Mat. 19; 16.
Mar. 10; 17.

Good teacher, what good shall I do to obtain

19 eternal life? *Jesus answered, Why callest thou*

20 me good? God alone is good. Thou knowest

the commandments. Do not commit adultery; do not commit murder; do not steal; do not give a false testimony; honour thy father and

Ex. 20; 12.
Deut. 5; 16.

21 thy mother. *He replied, All these I have ob-*

22 *served from my childhood. Hearing this, Je-*

sus said to him, yet in one thing thou art defi-

cient: sell all that thou hast, and distribute to

the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heav-

23 *en: then come and follow me. When he*

heard this, he was exceedingly sorrowful, for he

was very rich.

24 *Jesus perceiving that he was very sorrowful,* Mat. 19; 23.
Mar. 10; 23.

said, How difficult will it be for men of opu-

25 *lence to enter the kingdom of God! It is easi-*

er for a camel to pass through a needle's eye,

than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of

26 *God. The hearers said, Who, then, can be*

27 *saved? Jesus answered, Things impossible to*

men, are possible to God.

CH. 18.

SECT. XI.

Mat. 19 ; 27.
Mar. 10 ; 28.

28 *Then Peter said, Lo ! we have forsaken all,*
 29 *and followed thee. Jesus answered, Verily I*
 say unto you, that there is none who shall
 have forsaken his house, or parents, or brothers,
 or wife, or children, on account of the
 30 kingdom of God ; who shall not receive mani-
 fold more in return in this world, and in the fu-
 ture, eternal life.

Mat. 20 ; 17.
Mar. 10 ; 32.

31 *THEN Jesus taking the twelve aside, said to*
them, We are now going to Jerusalem, where
 all that the prophets have written shall be ac-
 32 *complished on the Son of Man. For he shall*
 be delivered to the Gentiles, and ridiculed and
 33 *insulted and spitted on. And after scourging,*
 they will kill him, and he shall rise again the
 34 *third day. But they understood none of these*
things : this discourse was hidden from them :
they did not comprehend its meaning.

Mat. 20 ; 29.
Mar. 10 ; 46.

35 *When he came near Jericho, a blind man,*
 36 *who sat by the way-side begging, hearing the*
crowd pass by, inquired what was the matter.
 37 *And being told that Jesus the Nazarene was*
 38 *passing by, he immediately cried, saying, Jesus,*
 39 *Son of David, have pity upon me. They who*
went before, charged him to be silent : but he
cried still the louder, Son of David, have pity
 40 *upon me. Jesus stopped, and commanded them*
to bring the man to him. And when he was
 41 *nigh, he asked him, saying, What dost thou*
 wish me to do for thee ? *He answered, Master,*
 42 *to give me my sight. And Jesus said to him,*
 Receive thy sight ; thy faith hath cured thee.

43 *Instantly he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God; and all the people saw it, and praised God.*

XIX. *When Jesus had entered, and was passing*
 2 *through Jericho, behold a man named Zaccheus,*
 3 *a rich man, and chief of the publicans, endeav-*
 4 *oured to see what sort of person he was, but could*
 5 *not for the press, being of a low stature. There-*
 6 *fore running before, he climbed up into a sycamore*
 7 *to see him, having observed that he was*
 8 *going that way. When Jesus came to the place,*
 9 *he looked up, and seeing him said, Zaccheus,*
 10 *make haste and come down, for to-day I must*
 11 *abide at thy house. And he made haste, and*
 12 *came down, and received him joyfully. When*
 13 *the multitude perceived this, they said, murmur-*
 14 *ing, He is gone to be entertained by a sinner.*
 15 *But Zaccheus presenting himself before Jesus,*
 16 *said, Master, the half of my goods I will give*
 17 *to the poor; and if in aught I have wronged*
 18 *any man, I will restore fourfold. And Jesus*
 19 *said concerning him, To-day is salvation come*
 20 *to this house, inasmuch as he also is a son of*
 21 *Abraham. For the Son of Man is come to seek*
 22 *and recover that which was lost.* Mat. 18; 11.
 23 *As the people were attentive, he added this*
 24 *parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and*
 25 *they fancied the reign of God would immediate-*
 26 *ly commence: A certain nobleman went abroad*
 27 *to procure for himself the royalty, and then re-*
 28 *turn; and having called ten of his servants, and*
 29 *delivered to them ten pounds, he said, 'Im-*

- 14 'prove these till I return.' Now his citizens hated him; and sending an embassy after him, protested, 'We will not have this man for our
- 15 'king.' When he returned, vested with royal power, he commanded those servants to be called to whom he had committed the money, that he might know what every one had gained.
- 16 Then came the first, and said, 'My Lord,
- 17 'thy pound⁴⁹ hath gained ten pounds.' He answered, 'Well done, good servant, because 'thou hast been faithful in a very small matter, 'receive thou the government of ten cities.'
- 18 And the second who came said, 'My Lord,
- 19 'thy pound hath gained five pounds.' He answered, 'Be thou too governor of five cities.'
- 20 Another came, saying, 'My Lord, here is thy 'pound, which I have kept laid up in a napkin;
- 21 'for I was afraid of thee, because thou art a 'hard master; thou exactest what thou didst 'not give, and reapest what thou didst not
- 22 'sow.' He answered, 'Out of thine own 'mouth, thou malignant servant, I will condemn thee. Didst thou know that I am 'a hard master, exacting what I did not give,
- 23 'and reaping what I did not sow? Why then 'didst not thou put my money into the bank, 'that at my return I might have received it
- 24 'with interest?' Then he said to his attendants, 'Take the pound from him, and give it to him
- 25 'who hath the ten pounds.' They answered, 'My Lord, he hath ten pounds.' [He replied,]
- 26 'I tell you, that to every one who hath, more

Mat. 13; 12.
& 25; 29.
Mar. 4; 25.
ch. 8; 18.

⁴⁹ About 7l. 10s. sterling.

SECT. XII.

CH. 19.

‘ shall be given ; but from him who hath not,
 27 ‘ even that which he hath shall be taken. But
 ‘ as for those mine enemies, who would not
 ‘ have me for their king ; bring them hither,
 ‘ and slay them in my presence.’

SECTION XII.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

28 *AFTER* this discourse Jesus walked foremost,
 29 travelling towards Jerusalem. When he ap- Mat. 21 ; 1.
Mar. 11 ; 1.
 proached Bethphage and Bethany, near the
 mountain called the Mount of Olives, he sent
 30 two of his disciples, saying, Go to yonder vil-
 lage, wherein, as ye enter, ye will find a colt
 tied on which no man ever rode ; loose him and
 31 bring him. If any one ask why ye loose him,
 ye shall answer, ‘ Because the Master needeth
 32 ‘ him.’ *Accordingly they who received this or-
 der, went and found every thing as he had told
 33 them. As they were loosing the colt, the own-
 34 ers said to them, Why loose ye the colt ? They
 35 answered, The Master needeth him. So they* Jo. 12 ; 14.
*brought him to Jesus, and having thrown their
 36 mantles upon the colt, set Jesus thereon. As he
 went, the people spread their mantles in the way
 37 before him. When he was so near as the de-
 scent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multi-
 tude of the disciples began to praise God in loud*

CH. 20.

SECT. XII.

acclamations, for all the miracles which they
 38 *had seen, saying, 'Blessed be the King who*
' cometh in the name of the Lord; peace in
' heaven, and glory in the highest heaven.'
 39 *Upon this some Pharisees in the crowd said to*
 40 *him, Rabbi, rebuke thy disciples. He answered,*
I tell you that, if these were silent, the stones
would cry out.

41 *When he came near and beheld the city, he*
 42 *wept over it, saying, O that thou badst consider-*
ed, at least in this thy day, the things which con-
cern thy peace! But now they are hidden from
 43 *thine eyes: for the days are coming upon thee*
when thine enemies will surround thee with a
 44 *rampart, and enclose thee, and shut thee up on*
every side, and will level thee with the ground,
thee and thy children, and will not leave thee
one stone upon another, because thou didst not
consider the time when thou wast visited.

ch. 21; 6.
 Mat. 24; 2.
 Mar. 13; 2.

Mat. 21; 12. 45 *Afterwards he went into the temple, and*
drove out thence those who sold and those who
 46 *bought therein, saying to them, It is written,*
 Mar. 11; 15.
 Is. 56, 7.
 Jer. 7; 11. *"My house is a house of prayer, but ye have*
" made it a den of robbers."

47 *And he taught daily in the temple, while the*
chief priests and the scribes, and persons of
 48 *principal note, sought his destruction, but could*
not devise how to effect it; for all the people
heard him with the greatest attention.

Mat. 21; 23.
 Mar. 11; 28.

XX. *One of those days, as he was teaching the*
people in the temple, and publishing the good
tidings, the chief priests and the scribes, with

2 *the elders, came upon him, saying, Tell us by what authority thou dost these things, or who*
 3 *is he that empowered thee? He answering, said unto them, I also have a question to put to*
 4 *you. Tell me then, Was the title which John had to baptize, from heaven or from men?*
 5 *But they reasoned thus with themselves, If we say, 'From heaven,' he will reply, 'Why then*
 6 *'did ye not believe him?' And if we say, 'From 'men,' all the people will stone us; for they are*
 7 *persuaded that John was a prophet. They therefore answered, that they could not tell*
 8 *whence. Jesus replied, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.*

9 *Then he spake to the people this parable: A*
 10 *man planted a vineyard, and farmed it out, and having travelled, continued long abroad. The*
 11 *season being come, he sent a servant to the husbandmen, to receive of the produce of the*
 12 *vineyard; but they beat him, and sent him back empty. Afterwards, he sent another servant,*
 13 *whom they, having beaten and used him shamefully, also sent away empty. He, afterwards, dispatched a third to them. Him like-*
 14 *wise they wounded and drove away. Then the proprietor of the vineyard said, 'What*
 15 *'shall I do? I will send my beloved son; they 'will surely reverence him, when they see him.'*
 16 *But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned thus among themselves, 'This is the*
 17 *'heir, come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be our own.' And having thrust*
 18 *him out of the vineyard, they killed him. What,*

Mat. 21; 33.
Mar. 12; 1.

therefore, will the proprietor of the vineyard
16 do to them? He will come and destroy those
husbandmen, and give the vineyard to others.

17 *And some of his hearers said, God forbid.*

Mat. 21 ; 42.
Ps. 118 ; 22.
Acts, 4 ; 11.
1 Pet. 2 ; 6.

*Jesus, looking on them, said, What then
meaneth that expression of Scripture, "A
" stone which the builders rejected is made
18 " the head of the corner. Whosoever shall fall
" upon that stone, shall be bruised ; but on
" whomsoever it shall fall, it will crush him to
19 " pieces." At that time the chief priests and
the scribes, knowing that he had spoken this pa-
rable against them, would have laid hands on
him, but feared the people.*

Mat. 22 ; 15.
Mar. 12 ; 13.

20 *And they watched him, and set spies upon
him, instructing them to personate conscientious
men, and surprise him in his words, that they
might consign him to the power and authority of
21 the procurator. These accosted him with this
question, Rabbi, we know that thou speakest
and teachest uprightly, and that, without res-
pect of persons, thou faithfully recommendest
22 the way of God. Is it lawful for us to pay
23 taxes to Cesar or not? He perceiving their
subtlety, answered, Why would ye inveigle me?
24 Show me a denarius. Whose image and in-
25 scription hath it? They answered, Cesar's. He
replied, Render, therefore, to Cesar that which
is Cesar's, and to God that which is God's.
26 Thus they could not surprise him in his dis-
courses before the people ; wherefore, admiring
his answer, they kept silence.*

Mat. 22 ; 23.
Mar. 12 ; 13.
Acts, 23 ; 8.

27 *Afterwards some of the Sadducees, who deny
a future state, came to him with this question :*

SECT. XII.

CH. 20.

28 Rabbi, Moses hath enjoined in his writings, Deut. 25 ; 5
 that a man whose brother dieth childless out-
 lived by his wife, shall marry the widow, and
 29 raise issue to his brother. Now there were
 seven brothers, the first of whom having taken
 30 a wife, died childless ; the second married the
 31 widow, and also died childless ; the third too
 married her, as did likewise the rest ; and all
 32 the seven died leaving no children. Last of all
 33 the woman also died. To which of them, there-
 fore, will she be wife at the resurrection ; for
 34 she hath been married to all the seven ? *Jesus*
answering, said unto them, The people of this
 35 world marry and are given in marriage ; but
 among them who shall be honoured to share in
 the resurrection and the other world, there will
 be neither marrying nor giving in marriage :
 36 For they cannot die any more ; because angel-
 like they are children of God, being children
 37 of the resurrection. But that the dead are
 raised, even Moses hath suggested, calling the
 Lord who appeared in the bush, the God of
 Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of
 38 Jacob. Now he is not a God of the dead, but
 of the living ; for they are all, [though dead to
 39 us,] alive to him. *Then some of the scribes*
said to him, Rabbi, thou hast spoken well.
 40 *After that they did not venture to ask him any*
more questions.

41 *And he said to them,* Why is it affirmed that Mat. 22 ; 41
 42 the Messiah must be a Son of David ? Yet Mar. 12 ; 35
Ps. 110 ; 1.
 David himself says in the book of Psalms,

CH. 21.

SECT. XIII.

“ The Lord⁵⁰ said to my lord, Sit at my right
 43 “ hand until I make thy foes thy footstool.”
 44 As David thus calleth him his lord, how can he
 be David’s son ?

ch. 11 ; 43.
 Mat. 23 ; 6.

45 *Then in the audience of all the people he said*
 46 *to his disciples, Beware of the scribes who love*
 to walk in robes, and affect salutations in public
 places, and the principal seats in the syna-
 gogues, and the uppermost places at feasts ;
 47 who devour the families of widows, and make
 long prayers for a disguise. These shall suffer
 the severest punishment.

Mar. 12 ; 41.

XXI. *As Jesus was observing the rich casting*
 2 *their gifts into the treasury, he saw an indigent*
 3 *widow throw in two mites. And he said, I tell*
 you truly, that this poor widow hath cast in
 4 more than any of them ; for all these, out of
 their superfluous store, have thrown into the
 sacred chest : whereas she hath thrown in all
 the little she had to subsist upon.

SECTION XIII.

THE LAST SUPPER.

Mat. 24 ; 1.
 Mar. 13 ; 1.
 ch. 19 ; 44.

5 *SOME having remarked that the temple was*
adorned with beautiful stones and presents, he
 6 *said, The time will come when these things*
 which ye behold, shall be so razed, that one

⁵⁰ *Jehovah.*

SECT. XIII.

CH. 21.

- 7 stone will not be left upon another. *Then they* Mat. 24 ; 3.
Mar. 13 ; 3.
asked him, saying, Rabbi, when will these
 things be ; and what will be the sign when they
 8 are about to be accomplished? *He answered,*
 'Take care that ye be not seduced ; for many
 will assume my character, saying, 'I am the
 'person,' and the time approacheth ; therefore
 9 do not follow them. But when ye shall hear
 of wars and insurrections, be not terrified ; for
 these things must first happen, but the end will
 not immediately follow.
- 10 *He added,* Then will nation rise against na- Mat. 24 ; 7.
Mar. 13 ; 8.
 11 tion, and kingdom against kingdom. And
 there shall be great earthquakes in sundry
 places, and famines, and pestilences ; there
 shall be also frightful appearances and great
 12 prodigies in the sky. But, before all this, ye
 shall be apprehended and prosecuted, and con-
 signed to synagogues, and imprisoned, and
 dragged before kings and governors, because
 13 of my name : and this will afford scope for your
 14 testimony. Be therefore resolved not to pre-
 15 meditate what defence ye shall make ; for I
 will give you an utterance and wisdom which
 none of your adversaries shall be able to refute
 16 or resist. And ye shall be given up even by
 parents and brothers, and kinsmen, and friends ;
 17 and some of you they will put to death. And,
 on my account, ye shall be hated universally.
 18 Yet not a hair of your head shall be lost. Save
 19 yourselves by your perseveranc.
- 20 Now when ye shall see Jerusalem invested Mat. 24 ; 15.
Mar. 13 ; 14.
 with armies, know that the desolation thereof

21 is nigh. Then let those in Judea flee to the mountains; let those in the city make their escape, and let not those in the country enter
 22 the city: for these will be days of vengeance, wherein all the denunciations of Scripture shall
 23 be accomplished. But woe unto the women with child, and unto them who give suck in those days: for there shall be great distress in
 24 the land, and wrath upon this people. They shall fall by the sword; they shall be carried captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden by the Gentiles, until the times of
 25 the Gentiles be over. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth the anguish of desponding nations; and roarings in the seas and floods;
 26 men expiring with the fear and apprehension of those things which are coming upon the world; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.
 27 Then they shall see the Son of Man coming
 28 in a cloud with great glory and power. Now when these things begin to be fulfilled, look up and lift up your heads, because your deliverance approacheth.

Mat. 24; 29.
 Mar. 13; 24.
 Is. 13; 10.
 Ezek. 32; 7.
 Joel, 2; 10,
 31. & 3; 13.

Rev. 1; 7.

Mat. 24; 32.
 Mar. 13; 28.

29 *He proposed to them also this comparison:* Consider the fig-tree, and the other trees.
 30 When ye observe them shooting forth, ye know of yourselves that the summer is nigh.
 31 Know ye in like manner, when ye shall see these events, that the reign of God is nigh.
 32 Verily I say unto you, that this generation
 33 shall not pass, until all be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall fail; but my words shall not

SECT. XIII.

CH. 22.

34 fail. Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, lest
 your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and
 drunkenness and worldly cares, and that day
 35 come upon you unawares : for, as a net, it shall
 36 enclose all the inhabitants of the earth. Be
 vigilant, therefore ; praying, on every occasion,
 that ye may be accounted worthy to escape
 all these impending evils, and to stand before
 the Son of Man.

37 *Thus Jesus taught in the temple by day, but
 retired at night to the mountain called the
 38 Mount of Olives. And every morning the peo-
 ple resorted early to the temple to hear him.*

XXII. *NOW the feast of unleavened bread, called* Mat. 26 ; 1.
Mar. 14 ; 1.
 2 *the passover, being near, the chief priests and
 the scribes sought how they might kill him ; for
 3 they feared the people. Then Satan entered* Mat. 26 ; 14.
Mar. 14 ; 10.
 4 *into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, who was of the
 number of the twelve. And he went and con-
 5 certed with the chief priests and officers, how
 he might deliver Jesus into their hands. And
 they were glad, and agreed to give him a cer-
 6 tain sum ; which Judas having accepted, watch-
 ed an opportunity to deliver him up without
 tumult.*
 7 *Now the day of unleavened bread being come,* Mat. 26 ; 17.
Mar. 14 ; 12.
 8 *on which the passover must be sacrificed, Jesus*
 9 *sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare
 for us the passover, that we may eat it. They
 asked him, Where wilt thou that we prepare
 10 it? He answered, When ye enter the city, ye
 will meet a man carrying a pitcher of water ;*

follow him into the house which he shall enter,
 11 and say to the master of the house, 'The
 ' teacher asketh thee, Where is the guest-
 ' chamber, where I may eat the passover with
 12 ' my disciples?' And he will show you a large
 13 upper room furnished; make ready there. *So
 they went, and having found every thing as he
 had told them, prepared the passover.*

14 *When the hour was come, he placed himself*
 15 *at table with the twelve Apostles, and said to*
them, Much have I longed to eat this passover
 16 *with you before I suffer! for I declare to you,*
that I will never partake of another, until it be
 17 *accomplished in the kingdom of God. Then*
 18 *taking a cup, he gave thanks, and said, Take*
this, and share it amongst you: for I assure
you, that I will not again drink of the product
of the vine, until the reign of God be come.

Mat. 26; 26.
 Mar. 14; 22.
 1 Co. 11; 23.

19 *Then he took bread, and, having given thanks,*
broke it, and gave it to them, saying, This is
my body which is given for you. Do this in
 20 *commemoration of me. He likewise gave the*
cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new
covenant in my blood, which is shed for you.

Mat. 26; 21.
 Mar. 14; 18.
 Jo. 12; 21.

21 Mark, however, that the hand of him who
 22 betrayeth me, is on the table with mine. The
 Son of Man is going away, as hath been deter-
 mined: nevertheless, woe unto that man by
 23 whom he is betrayed. *Then they began to in-*
quire among themselves, which of them it could
be that would do this.

24 *There had been also a contention among*
them, which of them should be accounted the

SECT. XIII.

CH. 22.

- 25 *greatest. And he said to them,* The kings of Mat. 20; 25-
 the nations exercise dominion over them, and Mar. 10; 42-
 they who oppress them are styled benefactors.
- 26 But with you it must be otherwise: nay, let
 the greatest amongst you be as the smallest,
 and him who governeth, as he who serveth.
- 27 For, whether is greater; he who is at table,
 or he who serveth? Is not he that is at table?
 Yet I am amongst you as one who serveth.
- 28 Ye are they who have continued with me in
 29 my trials. And I grant unto you to eat and to
 drink at my table in my kingdom (forasmuch
 as my Father hath granted me a kingdom,)
 and to sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes
 of Israel.
- 31 *The Lord said also,* Simon, Simon, Satan
 hath obtained permission to sift you [all] as
 32 wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy
 faith fail not; do thou, therefore, when thou
 hast recovered thyself, confirm thy brethren.
- 33 *He answered,* Master, I am ready to accompany Mat. 26; 34-
 34 thee both to prison and to death. *Jesus re-* Mar. 14; 30-
sponded, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not
 crow to-day, before thou have thrice denied
 that thou knowest me.
- 35 *Then he said to them,* When I sent you with- Mat. 10; 9-
 out purse, and scrip, and shoes, did ye want
 36 any thing? Nothing, *answered they.* But now,
said he, let him that hath a purse take it, and
 likewise his scrip; and let him who hath no
 37 sword, sell his mantle and buy one; for I tell Lk. 53; 12.
 you that this Scripture, "He was ranked
 "among malefactors," is now to be accom-

CH. 22.

SECT. XIII.

plished in me: for the things relating to me
 38 must [soon] be fulfilled. *They said*, Master,
 here are two swords. *He replied*, It is enough.
 39 *Then he went out, and repaired, as he was*
wont, to the mount of Olives, and his disciples
followed him.

Mat. 26 ; 36.
 Mar. 14 ; 32.

40 *Being arrived there, he said to them*, Pray
 41 that ye may not yield to temptation. *Then*
being withdrawn from them about a stone's cast,
 42 *he kneeled down and prayed, saying*, Father, if
 thou wilt, take this cup away from me ; never-
 43 theless, not my will, but thine be done. *And*
there appeared to him a messenger from heaven
 44 *strengthening him. And being in an agony of*
grief he prayed the more fervently, and his
sweat fell like clotted blood to the ground.
 45 *Having arisen from prayer, and returned to his*
disciples, he found them sleeping, oppressed
 46 *with grief, and said to them*, Why do ye sleep ?
 Arise and pray, lest the trial overcome you.

Mat. 26 ; 47.
 Mar. 14 ; 43.
 Jo. 18 ; 3.

47 *Before he had done speaking, he saw a multi-*
tude, and he who was called Judas, one of the
twelve, walked before them, and came up to
 48 *Jesus to kiss him. Jesus said to him*, Judas, be-
 49 trayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss ?
Now those who were with him, foreseeing what
would happen, said to him, Master, shall we
 50 strike with the sword ? *And one of them struck*
the servant of the high pricst, and cut off his
 51 *right ear. Jesus said*, Let this suffice ; and
 52 *touching his ear, he healed him. Then Jesus*
said to the chief priests, and the officers of the
temple-guard, and the elders who were come to

*apprehend him, Do ye come with swords and
53 clubs, as in pursuit of a robber? While I was
daily with you in the temple, ye did not at-
tempt to arrest me. But this is your hour,
and the power of darkness.*

SECTION XIV.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

54 *THEN they seized him, and led him away* Mat. 26 ; 57.
to the high priest's house. And Peter follow- Mar. 14 ; 53.
55 *ed at a distance. When they had kindled a* J. 18 ; 13,
fire in the middle of the court, and were sitting 24.
56 *round it, Peter sat down among them. And a* Mat. 26 ; 69.
maid-servant having observed him sitting by Mar. 14 ; 66.
the fire, and viewed him attentively, said, This Jo. 18 ; 16.
57 *man also was with him. But he disowned him,* & 25.
58 *saying, Woman, I know him not. A little*
while after, another seeing him, said, Thou also
59 *art one of them. Peter answered, Man, I am*
60 *not. About an hour after, another averred the*
same thing, saying, This man was surely with
61 *him, for he is a Galilean. Peter answered,*
Man, I know nothing of this matter. And just
as he spake the word, the cock crew. Then the
Lord turning, looked upon Peter, and Peter
called to mind the word which the Lord had

CH. 23.

SECT. XIV.

said unto him, "Before the cock crow, thou wilt
62 "disown me thrice." And Peter went out and
wept bitterly.

63 Meantime, they who had Jesus in charge,
64 mocked and beat him; and having blindfolded
him, struck him on the face, and asked him,
65 saying, Divine who it is that smote thee. And
many other abusive things they said against
him.

Mat. 27; 1.

66 As soon as it was day, the national senate,
with the chief priests and scribes, were assem-
bled, who having caused him to be brought into
67 their council-chamber, said to him, If thou be
68 the Messiah, tell us. He answered, If I tell
you, ye will not believe: and if I put a ques-
tion, ye will neither answer me, nor acquit me.
69 Hereafter the Son of Man shall be seated at
70 the right hand of Almighty God. They all
replied, Thou art then the Son of God? He
71 answered, Ye say the truth. Then they cried,
What further need have we of evidence? We
have heard enough ourselves from his own
mouth.

XXIII. AND the assembly broke up, and conduct-

Mat. 27; 11.
Mar. 15; 2.

2 ed Jesus to Pilate. And they accused him, say-
ing, We found this man perverting the nation,
and forbidding to give tribute to Cesar, calling
3 himself Messiah the King. Then Pilate asking
him, said, Thou art the King of the Jews?
4 He answered, Thou sayest right. Pilate said
to the chief priests and the multitude, I find
5 nothing criminal in this man. But they became

SECT. XIV.

CH. 23.

more vehement, adding, He raiseth sedition among the people, by the doctrine which he spreadeth through all Judea, from Galilee, 6 where he began, to this place. *When Pilate heard them mention Galilee, he asked whether 7 the man were a Galilean. And finding that he belonged to Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who was also then at Jerusalem.*

8 *And Herod was very glad to see Jesus: it was what he had long desired; having heard much of him, and hoping to see him perform 9 some miracle. He, therefore, asked him many questions, but Jesus returned him no answer. 10 Yet the chief priests and the scribes who were 11 present, accused him with eagerness. But Herod and his military train despised him: and having in derision arrayed him in a shining 12 robe, remanded him to Pilate. On that day Pilate and Herod became friends; for before they had been at enmity.*

13 *Pilate having convened the chief priests, the 14 magistrates, and the people, said to them, Ye have brought this man before me, as one who exciteth the people to revolt; yet having examined him in your presence, I have not found him guilty of any of those crimes whereof ye 15 accuse him. Neither hath Herod; for I referred you to him. Be assured, then, that he 16 hath done nothing to deserve death. I will 17 therefore chastise him, and release him. For it was necessary that he should release one to 18 them at the festival. Then all cried out together, Away with this man, and release to us Barabbas.*

Jo. 18; 38.
& 19; 4.

Mat. 27; 21.
Mar. 15; 12.

CH. 23.

SECT. XIV.

19 *Now Barabbas had been imprisoned for raising*
 20 *sedition in the city, and for murder. Pilate,*
willing to release Jesus, again expostulated.
 21 *But they cried, saying, Crucify, crucify him. A*
 22 *third time he repeated, Why? what evil hath*
this man done? I do not find him guilty of any
capital crime; I will therefore chastise him,
 23 *and release him. But they persisted, demand-*
ing, with much clamour, that he might be cruci-
fied. At last their clamours, and those of the
 24 *chief priests, prevailed: and Pilate pronounced*
 25 *sentence, that it should be as they desired. Ac-*
cordingly he released to them a man who had
been imprisoned for sedition and murder, whom
they required, and gave up Jesus to their will.

Mat. 27; 32.
 Mar. 15; 21.

26 *As they led him away, they laid hold of one*
Simon, a Cyrenian, coming from the country,
and laid the cross on him, that he might bear it
 27 *after Jesus. And a great multitude followed*
him, amongst whom were many women who la-
 28 *mented and bewailed him. But Jesus turning*
to them, said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not
for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your
 29 *children: for the days are coming wherein they*
shall say, 'Happy the barren, the wombs which
 30 *'never bare, and the breasts which never gave*
 31 *'suck:' then they shall cry to the mountains,*
'Fall on us,' and to the hills, 'Cover us:' for if
 32 *it fare thus with the green tree, how shall it*
fare with the dry? And two malefactors were
also led with him to execution.

Is. 2; 19.
 Hos. 10; 8.
 Rev. 6; 16.

Mat. 27; 35.
 Jo. 19; 18.

33 *When they were come to the place called*
Calvary, they there nailed him to the cross, and

SECT. XIV.

CH. 23.

the malefactors also, one at his right hand, the
 34 other at his left. And Jesus said, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do.
 35 And they parted his garments by lot. While Mar. 15 ; 24.
 the people stood gazing, even their rulers joined
 them in ridiculing him, and saying, 'This man
 saved others ; let him save himself, if he be the
 36 Messiah, the elect of God. The soldiers like-
 wise mocked him, coming and offering him vine-
 37 gar, and saying, If thou be the King of the
 38 Jews, save thyself. There was also an in-
 scription over his head, in Greek, Latin, and
 Hebrew, **THIS IS THE KING OF THE
 JEWS.**

39 Now, one of the malefactors who suffered
 with him, reviled him, saying, If thou be the
 40 Messiah, save thyself and us. The other re-
 buking him, answered, Hast thou no fear of God,
 thou who art undergoing the same punishment?
 41 And we indeed justly ; for we receive the due
 reward of our deeds ; but this man has done
 42 nothing amiss. And he said to Jesus, Remem-
 ber me, Lord, when thou comest to thy king-
 43 dom. Jesus answered, Verily I say unto thee,
 To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise.

44 And about the sixth hour there was darkness
 over all the land, which lasted till the ninth.
 45 The sun was darkened, and the veil of the tem-
 46 ple was rent in the midst. And Jesus said with
 a loud voice, Father, into thy hands I commit Ps. 31 ; 5.
 47 my spirit ; and having thus said, expired. Then
 the centurion observing what had happened,
 gave glory to God, saying, Assuredly this was

CH. 23.

SECT. XV.

48 a righteous man. *Nay, all the people who were present at this spectacle, and saw what*
 49 *passed, returned, beating their breasts. And all his acquaintance, and the women who had followed him from Galilee, standing at a distance, beheld these things.*

SECTION XV.

THE RESURRECTION.

Mat. 27 ; 57.
 Mar. 15 ; 42.
 Jo. 19 ; 38.

50 *NOW from Arimathea, a city of Judea, there was a senator named Joseph, a good and just man, who had not concurred in the resolutions and proceedings of the rest, and who himself*
 52 *also expected the reign of God. This man went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus.*
 53 *And having taken it down, he wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a tomb cut in stone, where-*
 54 *in no man had ever been deposited. Now that day was the preparation*⁵¹*, and the Sabbath*⁵²
 55 *approached. And the women who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee, followed Joseph, and observed the monument, and how the body was*
 56 *laid. When they returned, they provided spices and ointments, and then rested the Sabbath*⁵³*, according to the commandment.*

⁵¹ Friday.⁵² Saturday.⁵³ Saturday.

SECT. XV.

CH. 24.

- XXIV. *But the first day of the week*⁵⁴, *they went* Mat. 28; 1-
Mar. 16; 1-
Jo. 20; 1-
by day-break, with some others, to the tomb,
carrying the spices which they had provided;
 2 *and found the stone rolled away from the monu-*
 3 *ment; and having entered, they found not the*
 4 *body of the Lord Jesus. While they were in*
perplexity on this account, behold two men stood
by them, in robes of a dazzling brightness.
 5 *The women being affrighted, and fixing their*
eyes on the ground, these said to them, Why
 6 *seek ye the living among the dead? He* ch. 9; 22-
Mat. 16; 21-
& 17; 22-
Mar. 9; 31-
is not here, but is risen; remember how he
 7 *spake to you, before he left Galilee, saying,*
“The Son of Man must be delivered into the
“hands of sinners, and be crucified, and the
 8 *“third day rise again.” Then they remember-*
ed his words.
 9 *On their return from the monument, they re-* Mat. 28; 8.
ported the whole matter to the eleven, and to all
 10 *the other disciples. It was Mary Magdalene,*
and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James,
and other women with them, who told these
 11 *things to the Apostles: but their account ap-*
peared to them as idle tales; they gave them no
 12 *credit. Peter, however, arose, and ran to the*
monument; and stooping down, saw nothing
there but the linen lying. And he went away,
musings with astonishment on what had hap-
pened.
 13 *The same day, as two of the disciples were* Mar. 16; 12
travelling to a village named Emmaus, sixty
 14 *furlongs from Jerasalem, they conversed together*

CH. 24.

SECT. XV.

15 *about all these events. While they were con-*
versing and reasoning, Jesus himself joined
16 *them, and went along with them. But their*
eyes were so affected, that they did not know
17 *him. And he said to them, What subjects are*
these about which ye confer together? and
18 *why are ye dejected? And one of them named*
Cleopas, answered, Art thou alone such a
stranger in Jerusalem, as to be unacquainted
with the things which have happened there so
19 *lately? What things? said he. They answer-*
ed, Concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who was a
Prophet, powerful in word and deed, before
20 *God and all the people; how our chief priests*
and magistrates have delivered him to be con-
21 *demned to death, and have crucified him. As*
for us, we trusted that it had been he who
should have redeemed Israel. Beside all this,
22 *to-day being the third day since these things*
happened, some women of our company have
23 *astonished us; for having gone early to the*
monument, and not found his body, they came
and told us that they had seen a vision of an-
24 *gels, who said that he is alive. Whereupon*
some of our men went to the monument, and
found matters exactly as the women had relat-
ed; but him they saw not.

25 *Then he said to them, O thoughtless men,*
and backward to believe things which have
26 *been all predicted by the Prophets! Ought not*
the Messiah thus to suffer, and so to enter into
27 *his glory? Then beginning with Moses, and*
proceeding through all the Prophets, he ex-

SECT. XV.

CH. 24.

plained to them all the passages relating to
 28 himself. When they came near the village,
 whither they were travelling, he seemed as in-
 29 tending to go farther. But they constrained
 him, saying, Abide with us; for it groweth late,
 and the day is far spent. And he went in to
 30 abide with them. While they were at table to-
 gether, he took the loaf, and blessed and broke
 31 it, and distributed to them. Then their eyes
 were opened, and they knew him; and he disap-
 32 peared. And they said one to another, Did not
 our hearts burn within us, while he talked with
 us on the road, and expounded to us the Scrip-
 tures?

33 Immediately they arose, and returned to Je-
 rusalem, where they found the eleven, and the
 34 rest of their company, assembled, who said, The
 Master is actually risen, and hath appeared
 35 unto Simon. These also recounted what had
 happened on the road, and how he was discov-
 ered to them in breaking the loaf.

36 While they discoursed in this manner, Jesus
 stood in the midst of them, and said, Peace be
 37 unto you. But they were amazed and affright-
 38 ed, imagining that they saw a spirit. And he
 said to them, Why are ye alarmed? And where-
 39 fore do suspicions arise in your hearts? Behold
 my hands and my feet; it is I myself; handle
 me and be convinced; for a spirit hath not
 40 flesh and bones as ye see me have. Saying
 this, he shewed them his hands and his feet.
 41 While yet they believed not, for joy and amaze-
 ment, he said to them, Have ye here any thing

Mar. 16; 14.
 Jo. 20; 19.

42 to eat? *And they gave him a piece of broiled*
 43 *fish, and of a honey-comb, which he took and ate*
 44 *in their presence. And he said to them, This is*
 what I told you while I remained with you,
 that all the things which are written concern-
 ing me, in the law of Moses, and the Prophets,
 45 and the Psalms, must be accomplished. *Then*
he opened their minds, that they might under-
 46 *stand the Scriptures, and said to them, Thus it*
 is written, and thus it behoved the Messiah to
 suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day ;
 47 and that reformation, and the remission of sins
 should be proclaimed in his name among all
 48 nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Now ye are
 49 witnesses of these things ; and behold I send
 you that which my Father hath promised ; but
 continue ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye
 be invested with power from above.

50 *He then led them out as far as Bethany, and*
 51 *lifted up his hands and blessed them. And*
 while he was blessing them, he was parted from
 52 them, and carried up into heaven. *And having*
worshipped him, they returned to Jerusalem
 53 *with great joy ; and were constantly in the tem-*
ple, praising and blessing God. Amen.

Acts, 1 ; 8.
 Jo. 15 ; 26.
 Acts, 1 ; 4.

Mar. 16 ; 19.
 Acts, 1 ; 9.

PREFACE

TO

JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THAT the Apostle John, a fisherman of Bethsaida in Galilee, the beloved disciple, the younger brother of James called the greater or elder (there being two Apostles of the name) and son of Zebedee by Salome¹ his wife, one of the three most favoured Apostles, and who, with his brother James, on account of their zeal in their Master's service, were honoured with the title Boanerges, or *Sons of Thunder*, was, in the order of time, the last of the Evangelists, is manifest from the uniform voice of Christian antiquity. There are evident references to this Gospel, though without naming the author, in some Epistles of Ignatius, the authenticity of which is strenuously maintained by Bishop Pearson, and other critics of name.

¹ Compare Matth. xxvii. 55. with Mar. xv. 40.

§ 2. THE precise time when this Gospel was written has not been ascertained. The most probable opinion seems to be, that it was after John's return from exile in the isle of Patmos, whither, as we learn from himself, he had been banished *for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus*². This probably happened in the persecution under the emperor Domitian. It was in that island where God made those revelations to him, which were collected by him into a book, thence called the *Apocalypse* or Revelation. The last of his works is thought to have been his Gospel, which the entreaties of the Christian people, and pastors of Ephesus, and of other parts of Asia Minor, where he had his residence in the latter part of his life, prevailed on him to undertake. If so, it must have been towards the close of the first century when this Gospel first appeared in the church, and it was in the beginning of the second, when the above-mentioned Ignatius wrote his Epistles. There are also in Justin Martyr, both references to this Gospel, and quotations from it, though without naming the author. Tatian took notice of this Evangelist by name, and used his Gospel along with the rest in composing his Diatessaron. I need scarcely mention the notice that is taken of it in the Epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, or by Irenæus, who names all the Evangelists, specifying something peculiar to every one of them whereby he may be distinguished from

² Rev. i. 9.

the rest. I might add Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the whole current of succeeding ecclesiastical writers.

§ 3. THE account which Irenæus gives of the occasion of writing this Gospel is as follows³: “ John, desirous to extirpate the errors sown in “ the minds of men by Cerinthus, and sometime “ before by those called Nicolaitans, published his “ Gospel, wherein he acquaints us that there is “ one God who made all things by his word; and “ not, as they say, one who is the Creator of the “ world, and another who is the Father of the “ Lord; one the Son of the Creator, and another “ the Christ from the supercelestial abodes, who “ descended upon Jesus, the Son of the Creator, “ but remained impassible, and afterwards flew “ back into his own pleroma or fulness.”—Again, “ This disciple, therefore, willing at once to cut off “ these errors, and establish a rule of truth in the “ church, declares that there is one God Almighty “ who, by his word, made all things visible and in- “ visible; and that by the same word, by which “ God finished the work of creation, he bestowed “ salvation upon men who inhabit the creation. “ With this doctrine he ushers in his Gospel, *In “ the beginning was the word,*” &c. This testimony is of great antiquity, having been given in less than a century after the publication of the Gospel.

³ Advers. Hæres. lib. iii. cap. 11.

As Irenæus, however, names no authority, and quotes no preceding writer in support of what he has advanced in relation to the design of the Evangelist, it can only be considered by us as on the footing of ancient tradition.

§ 4. CLEMENT of Alexandria, who wrote not long after Irenæus, has, as we learn from Eusebius ⁴, added some particulars, as what, in his opinion, together with the entreaties of the Asiatic churches, contributed, not a little, to induce John to compose his Gospel. The first he mentions is, that the Evangelists who had preceded him, had taken little notice of our Lord's teaching and actions soon after the commencement of his ministry, and before the imprisonment of John the Baptist. One consideration therefore, which induced him, though late, to publish a Gospel, was to supply what seemed to have been omitted by those who had gone before him. For this reason he avoided, as much as possible, recurring to those passages of our Lord's history of which the preceding Evangelists had given an account. There was no occasion, therefore, for him to give the genealogy of our Saviour's flesh, as the historian expresses it ⁵, which had been done by Matthew and Luke before him. The same Eusebius

⁴ Lib. iii. cap. 24.

⁵ Lib. iii. cap. 24. *Εικοτως ουν την μεν της σαρκος του σωτηρος ημων γενεαλογιαν ατε Ματθαιω και Λουκα προγραφεισαν, αποσιωπησαι τον Ιωαννην.*

says in another place ⁶, quoting Clement, “ John, “ who is the last of the Evangelists, having seen “ that in the three former Gospels corporeal things “ had been explained, and being urged by his acquaintance, and inspired of God, composed a “ spiritual Gospel.” Thus it appears to have been a very early tradition in the church, that this Gospel was composed not only to supply what had not been fully communicated in the former Gospels, but also to serve for refuting the errors of Cerinthus and the Gnostics.

§ 5. YET in the time of Epiphanius, about the middle of the fourth century, an opinion, much the reverse of the former, was maintained by a few sectaries whom he calls *Alogians*⁷, because they rejected the Logos, that is, *the word*. Their opinion was, that Cerinthus himself was the author of this Gospel, an opinion, as Epiphanius clearly shows, quite improbable in itself, and unsupported by evidence; improbable in itself, because the words employed by the Evangelist, so far from confirming, contradict the sentiments of the Heresiarch, unsupported by evidence, because

⁶ Lib. vi. cap. 14. Τον μὲν τοι Ἰωαννην εἰχάτον συνιδόντα ὅτι τα σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδηλωταί, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνευματικῶς θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον.—τοσάντα ὁ Κλήμης.

⁷ Hær. 51. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν λόγον οὐ δεχόνται, τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένον, ἀλογοὶ κληθήσονται. This ancient controvertist does not disdain the humble aid of a pun. *Λογῶς* means *reason* as well as *word*; *αλογοὶ* *unreasonable*, or *against the word*.

there is nothing to counterbalance the contrary evidence above mentioned, the ancient tradition and uniform testimony, both of the friends and of the foes of Christianity, who had all concurred in affirming that this Gospel was written by John. In all the controversies maintained with Celsus, with Porphyry, and with the emperor Julian, who strained every nerve to undermine the authority of the Gospels, they never thought of controverting that they were written by those whose names they bear. So clear was this point accounted, for ages, even by the most acute adversaries of the Christian name.

§ 6. It deserves our particular attention, that this Gospel carries in its bosom strong internal evidences of the truth of some of those accounts which have been transmitted to us, from the primitive ages. At the same time that it bears marks more signal than any of them, that it is the work of an illiterate Jew; the whole strain of the writing shows that it must have been published at a time, and in a country the people whereof in general knew very little of the Jewish rites and manners. Thus, those who in the other Gospels are called simply the people or the multitude, are here denominated the Jews, a method which would not be natural in their own land, or even in the neighbourhood, where the nation itself, and its peculiarities, were perfectly well known. As it was customary in the East, both with Jews and others, to use proper names independently significant, which, when they went abroad, were translated

into the language of the country, this author, that there might be no mistake of the persons meant, was careful, when the Greek name had any currency, to mention both names, Syriac and Greek. Thus *Cephas, which denoteth the same as Peter*⁸; *Thomas, that is Didymus*⁹. The same may be said of some titles in current use, *rabbi, which signifieth doctor*¹⁰, *messiah, a term equivalent to Christ*¹¹. In like manner when there is occasion to mention any of the religious ceremonies used in Judea, as their purifications, or their festivals, it is almost invariably signified that the ceremony or custom spoken of is Jewish. Thus the water-pots are said to be placed for the Jewish rites of cleansing¹², *κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων*. The passover is once and again¹³ denominated the *Jewish passover*, *ἡ πασχα των Ιουδαιων*, a phrase used only by this Evangelist; and even any other religious feast is called¹⁴ by him *ἑορτη των Ιουδαιων*, a Jewish festival. This style runs through the whole. The writer every where speaks as to people who knew little or nothing about the Jews. Thus, in the conversation between our Lord and the woman of Samaria, the historian interrupts his narrative by inserting a clause to account to the Asiatic Gentile readers for that strange question put by the woman¹⁵, *How is it that thou, who art a Jew, askest drink of me who am a Samaritan?* The clause inserted for explanation is,

⁸ John, i. 43. ⁹ chap. xi. 16. ¹⁰ chap. i. 38. ¹¹ i. 41.

¹² chap. ii, 6. ¹³ chap. ii. 13. vi 4. xi. 55. ¹⁴ chap. v.

1. vii. 2. ¹⁵ chap. iv. 9.

(*for the Jews have no friendly intercourse with the Samaritans.*) Again, for the information of the same readers, after acquainting us that the Galileans had seen our Lord's miracles at Jerusalem during the festival, he adds¹⁶, *for they likewise attended the festival.* Neither of these explanatory clauses would ever have been thought of in Palestine, or perhaps even in Syria, where the enmity betwixt the Jews and the Samaritans, and the connection of Galilee with Judea, were better known.

§ 7. IT may be objected against the use I make of this observation, that as Mark and Luke are thought not to have published their Gospels in Palestine, it might have been expected that they also should have adopted the same manner. This in part I admit. I have accordingly pointed out¹⁷ a few examples of a similar nature in the Gospel by Mark. And as to the Evangelist Luke, if his Gospel was, as I have supposed¹⁸, published at Antioch, or in any part of Syria, there was not the same occasion. But, in answer to the objection, it may be further observed, that those published soon after our Lord's ascension, in whatever part of the world it was, were mostly for the use of converts from Judaism, with whom the church, in the beginning, chiefly abounded. But towards the end of the first century, the reception of this doctrine, particularly in Greece, Asia Minor, and those places which had

¹⁶ ch. iv. 45.¹⁷ Pref. to Mark, § 5.¹⁸ Pref. to Luke, § 3.

been most favoured with the teaching of Paul, became much more general among the Gentiles, who knew little or nothing of Jewish ceremonies. That the writer of this Gospel had such disciples chiefly in view, is very plain to every reader of discernment.

§ 8. THOUGH simplicity of manner is common to all our Lord's historians, there are evident differences in the simplicity of one compared with that of another. One thing very remarkable in John's style, is an attempt to impress important truths more strongly on the minds of the readers, by employing in the expression of them, both an affirmative proposition, and a negative. Thus ¹⁹: *All things were made by it (the word,) and without it not a single creature was made. He acknowledged and denied not, but acknowledged* ²⁰. Pleonasm is very frequent in this Gospel ²¹: *This man came as a witness to testify concerning the light: tautologies also, and repetitions. Thus it follows* ²²: *He was not the light, but came to testify concerning the light. Again* ²³: *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. This was in the beginning with God. See also the verses marked in the margin* ²⁴.

§ 9. HEBRAISMS are to be found in all the Evangelists; though it may be remarked, that some

¹⁹ John, i. 3. ²⁰ 20. ²¹ 7. ²² 8. ²³ 1, 2.

²⁴ John, i. 15. 26, 27. 30, 31. 33.

abound more with one sort of Hebraism, and others with another. A Hebrew idiom, very frequent with this writer, is the repetition or introduction of the personal pronoun in cases wherein it is perfectly redundant. Thus ²⁵: *Εφ' ὃν ἀν ἰδῆς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν*, literally, *On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him.* And ²⁶, *Ὁ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ἀξίος ἵνα γῶσῶ αὐτόν τὸν ἱμᾶντα τοῦ ὑποδηματός.* Here both the pronouns ὃν and αὐτόν are employed in relation to the same person, an idiom which it is hardly possible to express intelligibly in a modern language. As to other particularities in this writer, I shall only observe, that the conjunction καὶ is not so frequently used by John for coupling sentences, as by the rest. The introduction of any incident with the phrase καὶ ἐγένετο, generally rendered in the common translation, *and it came to pass*; in which the verb is used impersonally, though common in the other Gospels, never occurs in this.

§ 10. THE introduction of either facts or observations, by the adverb ἰδὼν, *behold*, is much rarer in this Gospel than in the rest. But in the change (or, as rhetoricians term it, enallage) of the tenses, so frequent with the Hebrews, John abounds more than any other of our Lord's biographers. He is peculiar in the application of some names; as of ὁ λόγος, *the word*, and ὁ μονογενῆς, *the only-be-*

²⁵ ch. i. 33.²⁶ 27.

gotten, to the Lord Jesus Christ, and of *ὁ παρακλητής*, *the monitor*, or, as some render it, *the advocate*, and others, *the comforter*, to the Holy Spirit. He is peculiar also in some modes of expression, which, though inconsiderable in themselves, it may not be improper to suggest in passing. Such is his reduplication of the affirmative adverb *Ἀμην*; for he always says, *Ἀμην ἀμην λεγω ὑμῖν*, *Verily verily I say unto you*. It is never used but singly by the rest. Upon the whole, John's style is thought to be more idiomatical, and less conformable to the syntactic order, than that of any other writer in the New Testament. There is none whose manner more bespeaks an author destitute of the advantages which result from letters and education.

§ 11. It is manifestly not without design that he commonly passes over those passages of our Lord's history and teaching, which had been treated at large by the other Evangelists, or, if he touches them at all, he touches them but slightly, whilst he records many miracles which had been overlooked by the rest, and expatiates on the sublime doctrines of the pre-existence, the divinity, and the incarnation of the Word, the great ends of his mission, and the blessings of his purchase. One of the most remarkable passages of our Lord's history, related by all the Evangelists except John, is the celebrated prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish temple, and state, about forty years before it happened. The three other

historians published it before the accomplishment, when their narratives could answer two purposes of the utmost importance, one was, to prove in due time, to impartial inquirers, an irrefragable evidence of our Lord's mission; the other, to serve to his disciples not only for the confirmation of their faith, but as a warning how to conduct themselves when the signs of an immediate completion should appear. Now neither of these purposes could be answered by the account of a prediction not written till after its accomplishment, when it might be speciously objected, if conformable, that the terms of the prediction were adjusted to the events; and as a warning, every body must see that it was too late to warn when the danger was past. Providence has disposed matters infinitely better, producing Christians who had the best opportunity to know what their master predicted, to attest the prophecy, many years before there was the remotest appearance of its completion, and a Jewish witness not a friend but an enemy to christianity to attest its fulfilment. Such was the historian Josephus, who probably knew nothing of the prediction; but had the very best opportunity of knowing circumstantially what was accomplished by the Romans, and who, by his faithful and accurate narrative of the facts, has unintentionally rendered an eminent service to the Christian cause. He has shown the exact conformity of those then recent and terrible transactions which he had witnessed, to what our Lord had foretold, and his Evangelists recorded at a time when there was not the shadow of any revolution,

much less of such a total overthrow of the country. For an example, on the contrary, of a fact related by John, but omitted by all the rest, the most striking by far is the resurrection of Lazarus, than which none of our Lord's miracles was greater in itself, or more signalized by the attendant circumstances. At first it appears astonishing that an action so illustrious as the resuscitation of a man who had been four days dead and buried, the most public too, in what may be called a suburb of the capital, in open day, the spectators numerous, as the paschal solemnity approached, which always drew an immense concourse to Jerusalem, and (which made it still more remarkable) a little before Christ's crucifixion; circumstances so impressive as to render it morally impossible that a fact so memorable should have escaped any christian historian of the time. But how happily does the circumstance remarked by Grotius, as suggested in the sequel of this Evangelist's narrative, remove every appearance of negligence in the sacred penmen, and account in the most rational manner for the profound silence they had observed on this article! *A great number of the Jews, says John²⁷, knowing that Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Lazarus, flocked thither, not on account of Jesus only, but likewise to see Lazarus whom he had raised from the dead. The chief priests, therefore, determined to kill Lazarus also; because he provided the occasion that many Jews forsook them, and*

²⁷ xii. 9, 10, 11.

believed on Jesus. Consequently to publish this miracle whilst Lazarus and his sisters lived in the vicinity of Jerusalem, was to set up that worthy family as marks to the malice, not of the chief priests only, but of all the enemies of the Christian name. If we may credit tradition, Lazarus lived after this resurrection, 30 years. Within less than 20, Matthew, Mark and Luke published their gospels. But it was 32 years at least, and consequently after the death of Lazarus, that John wrote his gospel. I subjoin an observation on the suppression of a small circumstance in another passage, which is similarly accounted for, and deserves notice, because the similarity itself is a presumption of the justness of the account in the solution of both. It has been observed that all the four mention, that in the slight attempt to resist, when Jesus was apprehended, the high priest's servant had an ear cut off, but John alone acquaints us that the disciple who did this was Simon Peter. The fact must have been well known to them all: but the other gospels were written in Peter's lifetime; this alone after his death, when the mention of that circumstance could nowise hurt him. The uniformity of this caution in the sacred writers appearing in different instances, renders the justness of the reasons assigned the more probable. I may add, that, from circumstances which to a superficial view seem to add improbability to a narrative, there arises sometimes, when nearly inspected, additional presumptive evidence of its truth. There is also in these hints what may serve to confirm the traditions and

early accounts we have both of the writers of the gospels, and of the time of their composition. This gospel may be truly said to interfere less with the rest than these do with one another: in consequence of which, if its testimony cannot often be pleaded in confirmation of theirs, neither is it liable to be urged in contradiction. It is remarkable also, that though this Evangelist appears, more than any of them, to excel in that artless simplicity, which is scarcely compatible with the subtlety of disputation, we have, in his work, a fuller display of the evidences of our religion, on the footing on which it then stood, than in all the rest put together.

§ 12. HERE we have also the true sources of Christian consolation under persecution, and the strongest motives to faith, patience, constancy, and mutual love, in every situation wherein Providence may place us. From the incidents here related, we may learn many excellent lessons of modesty, humanity, humility, and kind attention to the concerns of others. Nor does any one of those incidents appear to be more fraught with instruction, than the charge of his mother, which our blessed Lord, at that critical time when he hung in agony upon the cross, consigned to his beloved disciple²⁸. Though the passage is very brief and destitute of all artful colouring, nothing can impress more strongly, on the feeling heart, his respectful tenderness for a worthy parent, and his

²⁸ John, xix. 25, &c.

unalterable affection for a faithful friend. Upon the whole, the language employed in conveying the sentiments, is no more than the repository, the case. Let not its homeliness discourage any one from examining its invaluable contents. The treasure itself is heavenly, even the unsearchable riches of Christ, which the Apostle observes²⁹, to be committed *to earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may, to the conviction of all the sober-minded, be of God, and not of men.*

§ 13. THE Apostle John, by the concurrent testimony of all Christian antiquity, after suffering persecution for the cause of Christ, lived to a very great age, and having survived all the other Apostles, died a natural death at Ephesus in Asia Minor, in the reign of the emperor Trajan.

²⁹ 2 Cor. iv. 7.

THE
GOSPEL BY JOHN.

SECTION I.

THE INCARNATION.

1. *IN the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*
- 2 *This was in the beginning with God. All* Col. 1 ; 16.
- 3 *things were made by it, and without it not a*
- 4 *single creature was made. In it was life, and*
- 5 *the life was the light of men. And the light*
- shone in darkness ; but the darkness admitted*
- it not.*
6. *A man named John was sent from God.* Mat. 3 ; 1.
- 7 *This man came as a witness to testify concern-* Mar. 1 ; 2.
- ing the light, that through him all might believe.*

CH. 1.

SECT. 1.

8 *He was not himself the light, but came to testify*
 9 *concerning the light. The true light was he*
who, coming into the world, enlighteneth every
man.

10 *He was in the world, and the world was made*
 11 *by him ; yet the world knew him not. He came*
to his own home, and his own family did not re-
 12 *ceive him ; but to as many as received him, be-*
lieving in his name, he granted the privilege of
 13 *being children of God, who derive their birth*
not from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh,
nor from the will of man, but from God.

Mat. 1 ; 16.
 Lu. 2 ; 7.

14 *And the Word became incarnate, and so-*
journed amongst us (and we beheld his glory,
the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,)
 15 *full of grace and truth. (It was concerning him*
John testified, when he cried, " This is he of
 16 *" whom I said, He that cometh after me is pre-*
 17 *" ferred to me ; for he was before me.") Of*
his fulness we all have received, even grace for
 18 *his grace ; for the law was given by Moses, the*
grace and the truth came by Jesus Christ. No
one ever saw God ; it is the only begotten Son,
that is in the bosom of the Father, who hath
made him known.

1 Ti. 6 ; 16.
 1 Jo. 4 ; 12.

19 *NOW this is the testimony of John. When*
the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusa-
 20 *lem to ask him, Who art thou ? he acknowledg-*
ed and denied not, but acknowledged, saying, I
 21 *am not the Messiah. And they asked him,*
Who then ? Art thou Elijah ? He said, I am
not. Art thou the Prophet ? He answered, No.

SECT. I.

CH. I.

22 *They said*, tell then who thou art, that we may
 return an answer to them who sent us. What
 23 sayest thou of thyself? *He answered*, I am he
 whose voice proclaimeth in the wilderness,
 “Make straight the way of the Lord³⁰,” as
 24 said the Prophet Isaiah. *Now they who were*
 25 *sent were of the Pharisees. And they question-*
tioned him further, Why then dost thou bap-
 tize, if thou be not the Messiah, nor Elijah, nor
 26 the Prophet? *John answered*, I baptize in
 water, but there is one amongst you whom ye
 27 know not. It is he who cometh after me, and
 was before me, whose shoe-latchet I am not
 28 worthy to loose. *This happened at Bethany,*
upon the Jordan, where John was baptizing.
 29 *On the morrow John seeth Jesus coming to*
him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which
 30 taketh away the sin of the world. This is he
 concerning whom I said, “After me cometh a
 “man who is preferred to me; for he was be-
 31 fore me.” As for me, I knew him not; but to
 the end that he may be discovered to Israel, I
 32 am come baptizing in water. *John testified fur-*
ther, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from
 heaven like a dove, and remaining upon him.
 33 For my part, I should not have known him, had
 not he who sent me to baptize in water told
 me, ‘Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the
 ‘Spirit descending and remaining, the same is
 34 ‘he who baptizeth in the Holy Ghost.’ Having
 therefore seen this, I testify that he is the Son
 of God.

Mat. 3; 3.
 Mar. 1; 3.
 Lu. 3; 4.
 Is. 40; 3.

Mat. 3; 11.
 Mar. 1; 7.
 Lu. 3; 16.
 Acts, 1; 5.
 11; 16. &
 19; 4.

Mat. 3; 16.
 Mar. 1; 10.
 Lu. 3; 22.

³⁰ *Jehovah.*

CH. 1.

SECT. I.

35 *The next day John being with two of his dis-*
 36 *ciples, observed Jesus passing, and said, Behold*
 37 *the Lamb of God. The two disciples hearing*
 38 *this, followed Jesus. And Jesus turning about*
saw them following, and said to them, What
seek ye? They answered, Rabbi (which signi-
 39 *fieth Doctor,) where dwellest thou? He replied,*
Come, and see. They went and saw where he
dwelt; and it being about the tenth hour³¹,
 40 *abode with him that day. One of the two who,*
having heard John, followed Jesus, was Andrew
 41 *the brother of Simon Peter. The first he met*
was his own brother Simon, to whom he said,
We have found the Messiah³² (a name equiva-
 42 *lent to Christ³³.) And he brought him to Jesus.*
Jesus looking upon him, said, Thou art Simon,
the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas³⁴,
which denoteth the same as Peter³⁵.

43 *The next day Jesus resolved to go to Galilee,*
and meeting Philip, said to him, Follow me.
 44 *Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of An-*
 45 *drew and Peter. Philip meeteth Nathanael,*
and saith unto him, We have found the person
described by Moses in the law, and by the
 46 *Prophets, Jesus the son of Joseph, from Naza-*
reth. Nathanael saith unto him, Out of Naza-
 47 *reth can any good thing come? Philip answer-*
 48 *ed, Come and see. Jesus saw Nathanael*
coming to him, and said concerning him, Behold
an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile. Na-

Gen. 49; 10.
 Deu. 18; 18.
 Jer. 23; 5.

³¹ Four o'clock afternoon.

³² Anointed.

³³ Anointed.

³⁴ Rock.

³⁵ Rock.

SECT. II.

CH. 2.

thanael said unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered, I saw thee when thou wast under the fig-tree, before Philip called thee. Nathanael replying, said unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God: thou art the King of Israel. Jesus answered him, saying, Because I told thee that I saw thee under the fig-tree, thou believest: thou shalt see greater things than this. He added, Verily verily I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the messengers of God ascending from the Son of Man, and descending to him.

SECTION II.

THE ENTRANCE ON THE MINISTRY.

II. *THREE days after, there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. Jesus also and his disciples were invited to the marriage. The wine falling short, the mother of Jesus said to him, They have no wine. Jesus answered, Woman, what hast thou to do with me? My time is not yet come. His mother said to the servants, Do whatever he shall bid you. Now there were six water-pots of stone, containing two or three baths³⁶ a-piece, placed there for the Jewish rites of cleansing.*

³⁶ A bath contained about 7 1-half gallons.

CH. 2.

SECT. II.

- 7 *Jesus said to them, Fill the pots with water.*
 8 *And they filled them to the brim. Then he said, Draw now, and carry to the director of*
 9 *the feast. And they did so. When the director of the feast had tasted the wine made of*
 10 *water, not knowing whence it was (but the servants who drew the water knew,) he said, addressing the bridegroom, Every body presenteth the best wine first, and worse wine afterwards, when the guests have drunk largely; but thou hast reserved the best until now.*
 11 *This first miracle Jesus wrought in Cana of Galilee, displaying his glory: and his disciples believed on him.*
 12 *Afterwards he went to Capernaum, he and his mother, and his brothers, and his disciples; but they stayed not there many days.*
- 13 *AND the Jewish passover being nigh, Jesus*
 14 *went to Jerusalem; and finding changers sitting in the temple, and people who sold cattle,*
 15 *and sheep, and doves; he made a whip of cords, and drove them all out of the temple, with the sheep and the cattle, scattering the coin of the*
 16 *changers, and overthrowing their tables; and said to them who sold doves, Take these things hence. Make not my Father's house a house*
 17 *of traffic. Then his disciples remembered these words of Scripture, "My zeal for thy house consumeth me."*
 18 *Hereupon the Jews said to him, By what miracle dost thou shew us thy title to do these*
 19 *things? Jesus answering, said unto them, De-*

Ps. 69; 9.

Mat. 26; 61.
& 27; 40.

SECT. II.

CH. 3.

stroy this temple, and I will rear it again in three
 20 days. *The Jews replied*, Forty and six years Mar. 14; 58.
 & 15; 29. was this temple in building; and thou wouldst
 21 rear it in three days? *But by the temple he*
 22 *meant his body. When therefore he was risen*
from the dead, his disciples remembered that he
had said this, and they understood the Scrip-
ture, and the word which Jesus had spoken.

23 *While he was at Jerusalem, during the feast*
of the passover, many believed on him, when
 24 *they saw the miracles which he performed. But*
Jesus did not trust himself to them, because he
 25 *knew them all. He needed not to receive from*
others a character of any man, for he knew
what was in man.

III. *NOW there was a Pharisee, called Nicode-*
 2 *mus, a ruler of the Jews, who came to Jesus by*
night, and said to him, Rabbi, we know that
thou art a teacher come from God; for no man
can do these miracles which thou dost, unless
 3 *God be with him. Jesus answering, said unto*
him, Verily verily I say unto thee, unless a
man be born again, he cannot discern the reign
 4 *of God. Nicodemus replied, How can a*
grown man be born? Can he enter his moth-
 5 *er's womb anew, and be born? Jesus answered,*
Verily verily I say unto thee, unless a man be
born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter the
 6 *kingdom of God. That which is born of the*
flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit
 7 *is spirit. Wonder not, then, that I said to thee,*

CH. 3.

SECT. II.

8 Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so it is with every one who
 9 is born of the Spirit. *Nicodemus, answered,*
 10 How can these things be? *Jesus replied,* Art thou the teacher of Israel, and knowest not
 11 these things? Verily verily I say unto thee, we speak what we know, and testify what we have
 12 seen; yet ye receive not our testimony. If ye understood not when I told you earthly things; how will ye understand, when I tell you heav-
 13 enly things? For none ascendeth into heaven, but he who descended from heaven; the Son
 14 of Man, whose abode is heaven. As Moses placed on high the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be placed on high,
 15 that whosoever believeth on him may not perish, but obtain eternal life: for God hath so loved the world, as to give his only begotten
 16 Son, that whosoever believeth on him may not perish, but obtain eternal life. For God hath
 17 sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world may be saved by
 18 him. He who believeth on him shall not be condemned; he who believeth not is already condemned, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.
 19 Now this is the ground of condemnation, that the light is come into the world, and men have preferred the darkness to the light, because their
 20 deeds were evil. For whosoever doth evil, hateth the light, and shunneth it, lest his deeds

Num. 21; 9.

1 Jo. 4; 9.

ch. 12; 47.

ch. 1; 4.

SECT. II.

CH. 5.

21 should be detected. But he who obeyeth the truth cometh to the light, that it may be manifest that his actions are agreeable to God.

22 *After this, Jesus went with his disciples* ch. 4 ; 2.
into the territory of Judea, where he remained
 23 *with them, and baptized. John also was baptizing in Enon near Salim, because there was*
 24 *much water there ; and people came thither and*
were baptized. For John was not yet cast into
prison.

25 *Now John's disciples had a dispute with a*
 26 *Jew about purification. Whereupon they went*
to John, and said to him, Rabbi, he who was
 with thee near the Jordan, of whom thou gavest ch. 1 ; 27. 30
 so great a character ; he too baptizeth, and
 27 the people flock to him. *John answered, A*
 man can have no power but what he deriveth
 28 from heaven. Ye yourselves are witnesses for
 me, that I said, 'I am not the Messiah, but am
 29 'sent before him.' The bridegroom is he who ch. 1 ; 20.
 hath the bride ; but the friend of the bridegroom, who assisteth him, rejoiceth to hear the
 bridegroom's voice : this my joy therefore is
 30 complete. He must increase, while I decrease.
 31 He who cometh from above, is above all. He who is from the earth is earthly, and
 speaketh as being from the earth. He who
 32 cometh from heaven is above all. What he
 testifieth is what he hath seen and heard ; yet
 33 his testimony is not received. He who receiveth his testimony, voucheth the veracity of
 34 God: For he whom God hath commissioned,

Mat. 11 ; 27.
1 Jo. 5 ; 10.

relateth God's own words ; for [to him] God
35 giveth not the Spirit by measure. The Father
loveth the Son, and hath subjected all things to
36 him. He who believeth on the Son hath life
eternal ; he who rejecteth the Son, shall not
see life ; but the vengeance of God awaiteth
him.

SECTION III.

THE JOURNEY TO GALILEE.

ch. 3 ; 22.

IV. *JESUS, knowing that the Pharisees were
2 informed that he made and baptized more dis-
3 ciples than John (though it was not Jesus him-
self, but his disciples, who baptized,) left Judea,
and returned to Galilee.*

4 *Being obliged to pass through Samaria, he
came to a Samaritan city called Sychar³⁷, near
the heritage which Jacob gave his son Joseph.*

Gen. 33 ; 19.
& 48 ; 22.
Jos. 24 ; 32.

6 *Now Jacob's well was there. And Jesus, wearied with the journey, sat down by the well, it being about the sixth hour³⁸.*

7 *A woman of Samaria having come to draw
8 water, Jesus said to her, Give me to drink (for*

³⁷ In the Old Testament called *Shechem*.

³⁸ Twelve o'clock noon.

SECT. III.

CH. 4.

his disciples were gone into the city to buy
 9 *food ;) the Samaritan woman answered, How*
 is it that thou who art a Jew, askest drink of
 me who am a Samaritan? (*for the Jews have*
no friendly intercourse with the Samaritans.)
 10 *Jesus replied, If thou knewest the bounty of*
 God, and who it is that saith to thee, ‘ Give me
 to drink,’ thou wouldst have asked him, and he
 11 would have given thee living water. *She*
answered, Sir, thou hast no bucket, and the
 well is deep : whence then hast thou the living
 12 water? Art thou greater than our father Jacob,
 who gave us the well, and drank thereof him-
 13 self, and his sons, and his cattle? *Jesus replied,*
 Whoso drinketh of this water, will thirst again;
 14 but whoever shall drink of the water which
 I shall give him, shall never thirst more ; but
 the water which I shall give, shall be in him
 a fountain springing up to everlasting life.
 15 *The woman answered, Sir, give me this water,*
 that I may never be thirsty, nor come hither
 16 to draw. *Jesus said to her, Go, call thy hus-*
 17 *band, and come back. She answered, I have*
 18 *no husband. Jesus replied, Thou sayest well,*
 ‘ I have no husband ;’ for thou hast had five hus-
 bands ; and he whom thou now hast, is not thy
 19 husband ; in this thou hast spoken truth. *The*
woman said, Sir, I perceive that thou art a pro-
 20 *phet. Our fathers worshipped on this moun-* Deut. 12 ; 5.
 tain ; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place
 21 where men ought to worship. *Jesus answered,*
 Woman, believe me, the time approacheth,
 when ye shall neither come to this mountain,

CH. 4.

SECT. III.

nor go to Jerusalem, to worship the Father.

22 Ye worship what ye know not; we worship what we know: for salvation is from the

23 Jews. But the time cometh, or rather is come, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such are the

2 Cor. 3; 17. 24 worshippers whom the Father requireth. God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must

25 worship him in spirit and truth. *The woman replied, I know that the Messiah³⁹ cometh (that is, the Christ⁴⁰;) when he is come, he will*

26 teach us all things. *Jesus said unto her, I who speak unto thee am he.*

27 *Upon this his disciples came and wondered that he talked with a woman; yet none of them said, 'What seekest thou? or why talkest thou*

28 *'with her?' Then the woman left her pitcher, and having gone into the city, said to the people,*

29 *Come, see a man who hath told me all that ever I did. Is this the Messiah? They accordingly went out of the city and came to him.*

31 *Meanwhile the disciples entreating him, said, Rabbi, eat. He answered, I have meat to eat which ye know not of. Then said his disciples*

32 *one to another, Hath any man brought him food? Jesus answered, My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish his work.*

35 *Say ye not, 'After four months cometh harvest?' But I say, Lift up your eyes, and survey the fields; for they are already white*

36 *enough for harvest. The reaper receiveth*

Mat. 9; 37.
Lu. 10; 2.

³⁹ The anointed.

⁴⁰ The anointed.

SECT. III.

CH. 4.

wages, and gathereth the fruits for eternal life, that both the sower and the reaper may rejoice together. For herein the proverb is
 37 verified, 'One soweth, and another reapeth.' I
 38 send you to reap that whereon ye have bestowed no labour: others laboured; and ye get possession of their labours.

39 *Now many Samaritans of that city believed in him on the testimony of the woman who said,*
 40 *'He told me all that ever I did.'* When, therefore, they came to him, they besought him to stay with them, and he stayed there two days.
 41 *And many more believed because of what they heard from himself; and they said to the*
 42 *woman, It is not now on account of what thou hast reported, that we believe; for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is truly the Saviour of the world, the Messiah.*

43 *After the two days Jesus departed and went* Mat. 13; 57.
Mar. 6; 4.
Lu. 4; 24.
 44 *to Galilee [but not to Nazareth;] for he had himself declared that a prophet is not regarded*
 45 *in his own country. Being come into Galilee, he was well received by the Galileans, who had seen all that he did at Jerusalem during the festival; for they likewise attended the festival.*

46 *Then Jesus returned to Cana of Galilee, where he had made the water wine. And there* ch. 2; 1.
Mat. 4; 12.
Mar. 1; 14.
Lu. 4; 14.
 47 *lay sick at Capernaum, who, having heard that Jesus was come from Judea into Galilee, went to him, and entreated him to come and cure his*
 48 *son who was dying. Jesus said to him, Unless*

ye see signs and prodigies, ye will not believe.
 49 *The officer answered, Come, Sir, before my*
 50 *child die. Jesus replied, Go thy way. Thy*
son is well. And the man believed the word
 51 *which Jesus had spoken, and went his way. As*
he was returning, his servants met him, and ac-
 52 *quainted him that his boy was well. He then*
inquired of them the hour when he began to
mend. They answered, Yesterday, at the sev-
 53 *enth hour, the fever left him. Then the father*
knew that it was the same hour at which Jesus
said to him, ‘ Thy son is well ;’ and he and all
 54 *his family believed. This second miracle Jesus*
performed, after returning from Judea to
Galilee.

 SECTION IV.

THE CURE AT BETHESDA.

V. *AFTERWARDS* there was a Jewish festival,
 2 and Jesus went to Jerusalem. Now there is at
 Lev. 23; 2. Jerusalem, nigh the sheep-gate, a bath, called in
 Hebrew Bethesda⁴¹, which hath five covered
 3 walks: In these lay a great number of sick,
 blind, lame, and palsied people waiting for the
 4 moving of the water. For an angel at times

⁴¹ House of mercy.

SECT. IV.

CH. 5.

descended into the bath, and agitated the water; and the first that stepped in, after the agitation of the water, was cured of whatever disease he had.

5 Now there was one there who had been
6 diseased eight and thirty years. Jesus, who
saw him lying, and knew that he had been long
7 ill, said to him, Dost thou desire to be healed?

The diseased man answered, Sir, I have nobody
to put me into the bath, when the water is
agitated; but while I am going, another get-
8 teth down before me. Jesus said to him, Arise,
9 take up thy couch, and walk. Instantly the
man was healed, and took up his couch, and
walked.

10 Now that day was the Sabbath. The Jews Neh. 13; 19.
Jer. 17; 21.
therefore said to him that was cured, This is the
Sabbath. It is not lawful for thee to carry the
11 couch. He answered, He who healed me, said
12 to me, 'Take up thy couch and walk.' They
asked him then, Who is the man that said to
13 thee, 'Take up thy couch and walk?' But he
that had been healed, knew not who it was: for
Jesus had slept away, there being a crowd in
the place.

14 Jesus afterwards finding him in the temple,
said to him, Behold thou art cured; sin no
15 more, lest something worse befall thee. The
man went and told the Jews that it was Jesus
16 who had cured him. Therefore the Jews perse-
cuted Jesus, and sought to kill him, because he
had done this on the Sabbath.

17 But Jesus answered them, As my Father hith-
18 erto worketh, I work. For this reason the Jews

were the more intent to kill him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but by calling God peculiarly his Father, had equalled himself with

19 *God. Then Jesus addressed them, saying.*

Verily verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but as he seeth the Father do : for what things soever he doth, such doth the

20 Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all that he himself doth : nay, and will show him greater works than these,

21 works which will astonish you. For as the Father raiseth and quickeneth the dead, the

22 Son also quickeneth whom he will : for the Father judgeth no person, having committed

23 the power of judging entirely to the Son, that all might honour the Son, as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, hon-

24 oureth not the Father who sent him. Verily

verily I say unto you, He who heareth my doctrine, and believeth him who sent me, hath eternal life, and shall not incur condemnation,

25 having passed from death to life. Verily verily

I say unto you, the time cometh, or rather is come, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and hearing they shall live.

26 For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself ; and

hath given him even the judicial authority, be-

27 cause he is the Son of Man. Wonder not at this :

for the time cometh when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come

Mat. 25 ; 46. 29 forth. They that have done good, shall arise

to enjoy life ; they that have done evil, shall

30 arise to suffer punishment. I can do nothing.

SECT. IV.

CH. 5.

of myself; as I hear I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not to please myself, but to please the Father who sent me.

31 If I [alone] testify concerning myself, my tes-
 32 timony is not to be regarded: there is another
 who testifieth concerning me; and I know that
 33 his testimony of me ought to be regarded. Ye ch. 1; 7, 15.
19; 29. yourselves sent to John, and he bore witness to
 34 the truth. As for me, I need no human testi-
 35 mony; I only urge this for your salvation. He
 was the lighted and shining lamp; and for
 a while ye were glad to enjoy his light.

36 But I have greater testimony than John's;
 for the works which the Father hath empow-
 ered me to perform, the works themselves
 which I do, testify for me, that the Father hath
 sent me.

37 Nay, the Father who sent me, hath himself Mat. 3; 16.
Mar. 1; 10.
Lu. 3; 22. attested me. Did ye never hear his voice; or
 38 see his form? Or have ye forgotten his decla-
 ration, that ye believe not him whom he hath
 commissioned?

39 Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think
 to obtain, by them, eternal life. Now these
 40 also are witnesses for me; yet ye will not come
 41 unto me that ye may obtain life. I desire not
 42 honour from men; but I know you, that ye are
 43 strangers to the love of God. I am come in
 my Father's name, and ye do not receive me;
 if another come in his own name, ye will re-
 44 ceive him. How can ye believe, while ye ch. 12; 43. court
 honour one from another, regardless of
 the honour which cometh from God alone?

45 Do not think that I am he who will accuse you
to the Father. Your accuser is Moses, in
46 whom ye confide. For if ye believed Moses,
ye would believe me, for he wrote concerning
Deu. 18; 15. 47 me. But if ye believe not his writings, how
shall ye believe my words?

SECTION V.

THE PEOPLE FED IN THE DESERT.

VI. *AFTERWARDS* Jesus crossed the sea of Ga-
2 lilee [also called] of Tiberias: and a great
multitude followed him, because they had seen
3 the miraculous cures which he performed. And
Jesus went up upon a mountain; where he sat
4 down with his disciples. Now the passover, the
Jewish festival, was near.

Mat. 14; 15.
Mar. 6; 35.
Lu. 9; 12.

5 Jesus lifting up his eyes, and perceiving that
a great multitude was flocking to him, said to
Philip, Whence shall we buy bread to feed
6 these people? (This he said to try him; for
7 he knew himself what he was to do.) Philip
answered, Two hundred denarii⁴² would not
purchase bread enough to afford every one a
8 morsel. One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon

⁴² About 6l. 5s. sterling.

SECT. V.

CH. 6.

9 *Peter's brother, said to him, Here is a boy who hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes,*
 10 *but what are they among so many? Jesus said, Make the men lie down. Now there was much grass in the place. So they lay down in*
 11 *number about five thousand. And Jesus took the loaves, and having given thanks, distributed them to those who had' lien down. He gave them also of the fishes as much as they would.*
 12 *When they had eaten sufficiently, he said to his disciples, Gather up the fragments which re-*
 13 *main, that nothing be lost. They therefore gathered, and with the fragments which the people had left, of the five barley loaves, they filled*
 15 *twelve baskets. When those men had seen the miracle which Jesus had wrought, they said, This is certainly the Prophet who cometh into*
 15 *the world. Then Jesus knowing that they intended to come, and carry him off to make him king, withdrew again alone to the mountain.* Mat. 14 ; 22.
 16 *In the evening his disciples went to the sea, and having embarked, were passing by sea to*
 17 *Capernaum. It was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them. And the water was raised*
 19 *by a tempestuous wind. When they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs⁴⁵, they observed Jesus walking on the sea, very near*
 20 *the bark, and were afraid. But he said to them, It is I, be not afraid. Then they gladly received him into the bark ; and the bark was immediately at the place whither they were going.* Mar. 6 ; 45.

⁴⁵ Between three and four miles.

CH. 6.

SECT. V.

- 22 *On the morrow, the people who were on the sea-side, knowing that there had been but one boat there, and that Jesus went not into the boat*
- 23 *with his disciples, who went alone (other boats however arrived from Tiberias, nigh the place where they had eaten, after the Lord had given*
- 24 *thanks,) knowing, besides, that neither Jesus nor his disciples were there, embarked and went to Capernaum seeking Jesus.*
- 25 *Having found him on the opposite shore, they said to him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?*
- 26 *Jesus answered, Verily verily I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw miracles, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were satisfi-*
- 27 *ed. Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which endureth through eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you : for to him the Father, that is, God, hath given*
- 28 *his attestation. They asked him, therefore, What are the works which God requireth us to*
- 29 *do? Jesus answered, This is the work which God requireth, that ye believe on him whom*
- 30 *he hath commissioned. They replied, What miracle then dost thou, that seeing it, we may*
- 31 *believe thee? What dost thou perform? Our Fathers ate the manna in the desert, as it is written, "He gave them bread of heaven to*
- 32 *"eat." Jesus then said to them, Verily verily I say unto you, Moses did not give you the bread of heaven; but my Father giveth you*
- 33 *the true bread of heaven: for the bread of God is that which descendeth from heaven, and*
- 34 *giveth life to the world. They said, therefore,*

Mat. 3; 7.
Mar. 1; 11.
Lu. 3; 22.

1 Jo. 3; 23.

Ex. 16; 14.
Num. 11; 6.
Ps. 78; 25.
Wis. 16; 20.

SECT. V.

CH. 6.

- to him, Master, give us always this bread.
- 35 *Jesus answered*, I am the bread of life. He who cometh to me shall never hunger, and he who believeth on me shall never thirst.
- 36 But as I told you, though ye have seen me,
- 37 ye do not believe. Whatever the Father giveth me, will come to me; and him who cometh to me I will not reject. For I descended from heaven to do, not mine own will, but the will of him who sent me. Now this is the will of him who sent me, that I should lose nothing of what he hath given me, but raise the whole again at the last day. This is the will of him who sent me, that whoever recognizeth the Son and believeth on him, should obtain eternal life, and that I should raise him again at the last day.
- 41 *The Jews then murmured against him, because he said*, “*I am the bread which descended*
- 42 *from heaven :*” *and they said*, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then doth he say, “*I descended from heaven ?*” *Jesus therefore answered*, Murmur not amongst yourselves :
- 43 no man can come unto me, unless the Father who hath sent me, draw him; and him I will raise again at the last day. It is written in the prophets, “*They shall be all taught of God.*”
- 45 Every one who hath heard, and learnt from the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man, except him who is from God, hath seen the Father. He indeed hath seen the Father.
- 47 Verily verily I say unto you, He who believeth on me hath eternal life. I am the

Mat. 13 ; 55.
Mar. 6 ; 3.

Is. 54 ; 13.

Mat. 11 ; 27.

49 bread of life. Your fathers ate the manna in
 50 the desert, and died. Behold the bread which
 descended from heaven, that whoso eateth
 51 thereof may not die. I am the living bread
 which descended from heaven. Whoso eateth
 of this bread shall live for ever; and the bread
 that I will give is my flesh, which I give for
 the life of the world.

52 *The Jews, then, debated among themselves,*
saying, How can this man give us his flesh to
 53 eat? *Jesus, therefore, said to them,* Verily verily
 I say unto you, Unless ye eat the flesh of the
 Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have not
 54 life in you. He that eateth my flesh, and
 drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will
 55 raise him again at the last day: for my flesh is
 56 truly meat, and my blood is truly drink. He
 who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood,
 57 abideth in me, and I abide in him. As the Fa-
 ther liveth who sent me, and I live by the Fa-
 ther; even so he who feedeth on me, shall live
 58 by me. This is the bread which descended
 from heaven. It is not like the manna which
 your fathers ate, for they died: he that eateth
 59 this bread shall live for ever. *This discourse*
he spake in a synagogue, teaching in Capernaum.

60 *Many of his disciples having heard it, said,*
 This is hard doctrine, who can understand it?
 61 *Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples mur-*
mured at it, said to them, Doth this scandalize
 62 you? What if ye should see the Son of Man
 61 reascending thither, where he was before? It

SECT. V.

CH. 7.

is the Spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I speak unto
 64 you are spirit and life. But there are some of
 you who do not believe. (*For Jesus knew from
 the beginning who they were that did not be-
 lieve, and who he was that would betray him.*)
 65 *He added,* Therefore I said to you, that no
 man can come unto me, unless it be given him
 by my Father.

66 *From this time many of his disciples with-
 67 drew, and accompanied him no longer. Then
 said Jesus to the twelve,* Will ye also go away ?
 68 *Simon Peter answered,* Master, to whom should
 we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life :
 69 and we believe and know that thou art the
 70 Messiah, the Son of the living God. *Jesus an-
 swered them,* Have not I chosen you twelve ?
 71 yet one of you is a spy. *He meant Judas Is-
 cariot son of Simon ; for it was he who was to
 betray him, though he was one of the twelve.*

Mat. 16 ; 16.
 Mar. 8 ; 29.
 Lu. 9 ; 20.

VII. *After this Jesus travelled about in Galilee ;
 for he would not reside in Judea, because the
 Jews sought to kill him.*

SECTION VI.

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

Lev. 23 ; 34.

2 *NOW* the Jewish feast of tabernacles was
 3 near. His brothers, therefore, said to him,
 Leave this country, and go into Judea, that thy
 disciples may also see the works which thou
 4 dost. For whosoever courteth renown, doth
 nothing in secret : since thou performest such
 5 things, show thyself to the world. (*For not*
 6 *even his brothers believed on him.*) *Jesus an-*
swered, My time is not yet come ; any time
 7 will suit you. The world cannot hate you ;
 but me it hateth, because I disclose the wick-
 8 edness of its actions. Go ye to this festival.
 I go not yet thither, because it is not my time.
 9 *Having said this, he remained in Galilee.*

ch. 8 ; 20.

10 *But when his brothers were gone, he also went*
to the festival, not publicly, but rather privately.
 11 *At the festival, the Jews inquired after him, and*
 12 *said, Where is he ? And there was much whis-*
pering among the people concerning him. Some
said, He is a good man. Others, No ; he se-
 13 *duceth the multitude. Nobody, however, spoke*
openly of him, for fear of the Jews.
 14 *About the middle of the festival, Jesus went*

SECT. VI.

CH. 7.

15 *into the temple and was teaching. And the Jews said with astonishment, Whence cometh this man's learning who was never taught?*

16 *Jesus made answer, My doctrine is not mine,*

17 *but his who sent me. Whosoever is minded to do his will, shall discern whether my doctrine proceed from God or from myself. Whoever teacheth what proceedeth from himself, seeketh to promote his own glory; whosoever seeketh to promote the glory of him who sent him, deserveth credit, and is a stranger to de-*

19 *ceit. Did not Moses give you the law? Yet none of you keepeth the law. Why do ye seek to kill me? The people answered, Thou art possessed. Who seeketh to kill thee?*

21 *Jesus replied, I have performed one action which surpriseth you all. Moses instituted circumcision among you (not that it is from Moses, but from the patriarchs,) and ye circum-*

23 *cise on the Sabbath⁴⁴. If, on the Sabbath⁴⁵, a child receive circumcision, that the law of Moses may not be violated; are ye incensed against me, because I have, on the Sabbath⁴⁶ cured a man whose whole body was disabled?*

24 *Judge not from personal regards, but judge according to justice.*

25 *Then some inhabitants of Jerusalem said, Is not this he whom they seek to kill? Lo! he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing to him. Do the rulers indeed acknowledge that this is*

27 *the Messiah? But we know whence this man*

Ex. 24; 3.
ch. 5; 18.

Lev. 12; 3.

Gen. 17; 10.

Deut. 1; 16.

⁴⁴ Saturday.⁴⁵ Saturday.⁴⁶ Saturday.

is ; whereas, when the Messiah shall come, no-
 28 body will know whence he is. *Jesus, who was
 then teaching in the temple, cried, Do ye know,
 both who, and whence, I am? I came not of
 myself. But he is true who sent me, whom ye*
 29 *know not. As for me, I know him, because I
 came from him, and am commissioned by him.*
 30 *Then they sought to apprehend him, but none
 laid hands on him ; for his hour was not yet*
 31 *come. Many of the people, however, believed
 on him, and said, When the Messiah shall
 come, will he do more miracles than this man
 doth ?*

32 *When the Pharisees heard that the people
 muttered such things concerning him, they and
 the chief priests dispatched officers to seize him.*

33 *Jesus therefore said, Yet a little while I re-
 main with you ; then I go to him who sent me.*

ch. 13 ; 33.

34 *Ye shall seek me, but shall not find me, nor be
 35 able to get thither where I shall be. The
 Jews said among themselves, Whither will he
 go that we shall not find him? Will he go to
 the dispersed Greeks, and teach the Greeks ?*

36 *What meaneth he by saying, “ Ye shall seek
 “ me, but shall not find me, nor be able to get
 “ thither where I shall be ?”*

Lev. 23 ; 36.

38 *On the last and greatest day of the festival
 Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst,
 38 let him come unto me and drink. He who be-
 lieveth on me, as Scripture saith, shall prove a
 cistern whence rivers of living water shall flow.*

Is. 44 ; 3.
 Joel, 2 ; 23.
 Acts, 2 ; 16.

39 *This he spake of the Spirit which they who be-
 lieved on him were to receive ; for the Spirit*

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

was not yet [given,] because Jesus was not yet glorified. Many of the people having heard
 40 what was spoken, said, This is certainly the
 41 Prophet. Some said, This is the Messiah.

Others, Doth the Messiah come from Gallilee?
 42 Doth not Scripture say, that the Messiah will
 be of the posterity of David, and come from
 Bethlehem, the village whence David was?
 43 Thus the people were divided concerning him;
 and some of them would have seized him, but
 nobody laid hands upon him.

Mic. 5; 2.
 Mat. 2; 5.

45 Then the officers returned to the chief priests
 and Pharisees, who asked them, Wherefore
 46 have ye not brought him? The officers answer-
 47 ed, Never man spake like this man. The Pha-
 48 risees replied, Are ye also seduced? Hath any
 of the rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on
 49 him? But this populace which knoweth not
 50 the law is accursed. Nicodemus, one of them-
 selves (he who came to Jesus by night,) said to
 51 them, Doth our law permit us to condemn a
 man without hearing him, and knowing what
 52 he hath done? They answered him, Art thou
 also a Galilean? Search and thou wilt find, that
 53 prophets arise not out of Galilee. [Then eve-
 VIII. ry man went to his house: but Jesus went to
 the Mount of Olives.

ch. 3; 2.
 Deu 17; 8.
 and 19; 15.

2 EARLY in the morning he returned to the
 temple, and all the people having come to him,
 3 he sat down and taught them. Then the scribes
 and the pharisees brought to him a woman tak-
 4 en in adultery, and having placed her in the

middle, said to him, Rabbi, this woman was surprised in the act of adultery. Now Moses hath commanded in the law that such should

be stoned; but what sayest thou? They said this to try him, that they might have matter for accusing him. But Jesus having stooped down was writing with his finger upon the ground.

As they continued asking him, he raised himself and said to them, Let him who is sinless amongst you, throw the first stone at her.

Again having stooped down, he wrote upon the ground. They hearing that, withdrew one after another, the eldest first, till Jesus was left alone

with the woman standing in the middle. Jesus raising himself, and seeing none but the woman, said to her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? Hath nobody passed sentence on thee?

She answered, Nobody, Sir. Jesus said unto her, Neither do I pass sentence on thee. Go and sin no more.]

ch. 1 ; 4.
& 9 ; 5.

AGAIN Jesus addressed the people, saying, I am the light of the world: he who followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life. The pharisees, therefore, retorted, Thou testifiest concerning thyself, thy testimony is not to be regarded. Jesus answered, Though I testify concerning myself, my testimony ought to be regarded; because I know whence I came, and whither I go. As for you, ye know not whence I come, and whither I go. Ye judge from passion, I judge nobody: and if I do, my judgment ought to be regarded; for I am not single, but concur with

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

- 17 the Father who sent me. It is a maxim in your law, that the concurrent testimony of two
 18 is credible. Now I am one who testify concerning myself; the Father that sent me is
 19 another who testifieth of me. *Then they asked him, Where is thy Father? Jesus answered, Ye know neither me, nor my Father: if ye knew me, ye would know my Father also.*
- 20 *These things Jesus spake in the treasury, as he taught in the temple, and nobody seized him, his hour not being yet come.*
- 21 *Again Jesus said to them, I am going away; ye will seek me, and shall die in your sin;*
 22 *whither I go, ye cannot come. Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself, that he saith,*
 23 *“Whither I go, ye cannot come?” He said to them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above. Ye are of this world; I am not of this world;*
 24 *therefore I said, Ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in*
 25 *your sins. They, therefore, asked him, Who art thou? Jesus answered, The same that I told*
 26 *you formerly. I have many things to say of you, and to reprove in you: but he who sent me is worthy of belief; and I do but publish to the world what I have learnt from him.*
- 27 *They did not perceive that he meant the Father.*
 28 *Jesus, therefore, said to them, When ye shall have raised the Son of Man on high, then ye shall know what I am; and that I do nothing of myself, and say nothing which the Father hath not taught me. And he who sent me is*
 29 *with me. The Father hath not left me alone,*

Deut. 17; 6.
& 19; 15.

CH. 8.

SECT. VI.

30 because I always do what pleaseth him. *While*
 31 *he spake thus, many believed on him. Jesus,*
therefore, said to those Jews who believed him,
 If ye persist in my doctrine, ye are my disci-
 32 ples indeed. And ye shall know the truth ;
 and the truth shall make you free.

33 *Some made answer, We are Abraham's off-*
 offspring, and were never enslaved to any man.
 How sayest thou, 'Ye shall be made free?'

Ro. 6 ; 16.
 2 Pet. 2 ; 19.

34 *Jesus replied, Verily verily I say unto you,*
 whosoever committeth sin is a slave to sin.
 35 Now the slave abideth not in the family per-
 36 petually ; the son abideth perpetually. If,
 therefore, the Son make you free, ye will be
 37 free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's
 offspring, yet ye seek to kill me, because my
 38 doctrine hath no place in you. I speak what I
 have seen with my Father ; and ye do what ye
 39 have learnt from your father. *They answered,*
 Abraham is our father. *Jesus replied, If ye*
 were Abraham's children, ye would act as
 40 Abraham acted. But now ye seek to kill me,
 a man who have told you the truth which I re-
 ceived from God. Abraham acted not thus.
 41 Ye do the deeds of your father. *They answer-*
ed, We were not born of fornication. We have
 42 *one Father, even God. Jesus replied, If God*
 were your Father, ye would love me ; for I
 proceeded, and am come from God. I came
 43 not of myself. He sent me. Why do ye not
 understand my language ? It is because ye can-
 44 not bear my doctrine. The devil is your fath-
 er, and the desires of your father ye will grati-
 fy : he was a man-slayer from the beginning :

1 Jo. 3 ; 8.

SECT. VI.

CH. 8.

he swerved from the truth, because there is no
 veracity in him. When he telleth a lie, he
 speaketh suitably to his character; for he is a
 45 liar, and the father of lying. As for me, be-
 cause I speak the truth, ye do not believe me.
 Which of you convicteth me of falsehood?
 And if I speak truth, why do ye not believe
 me? He who is of God regardeth God's words.
 47 Ye regard them not, because ye are not of God. 1 Jo. 4; 6.
 48 *The Jews then answered,* Have we not rea-
 son to say, Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a
 49 demon? *Jesus replied,* I have not a demon;
 but I honour my Father, and ye dishonour me.
 50 As for me, I seek not to promote my own glo-
 51 ry; another seeketh it who judgeth. Verily
 verily I say unto you, Whoever keepeth my
 52 word, shall never see death. *The Jews then
 said to him,* Now we are certain that thou hast
 a demon: Abraham is dead, and the prophets;
 yet thou sayest, 'Whoever keepeth my word,
 53 'shall never taste death.' Art thou greater
 than our father Abraham, who is dead? The
 prophets also are dead, whom thinkest thou
 54 thyself? *Jesus answered,* If I commend my-
 self, my commendation is nothing: it is my
 Father whom ye call your God who commend-
 55 eth me. Nevertheless ye know him not; but
 I know him; and if I should say, I know him
 not, I should speak falsely like you: but I
 56 know him, and keep his word. Abraham your
 father longed to see my day, and he saw and
 57 rejoiced. *The Jews replied,* Thou art not yet
 fifty years old, and thou hast seen Abraham?

58 *Jesus answered, Verily verily I say unto you,*
 59 *Before Abraham was born, I am. Then they*
took up stones to cast at him; but Jesus con-
cealed himself and went out of the temple, pass-
ing through the midst of them.

 SECTION VII.

THE CURE OF THE MAN BORN BLIND.

IX. *AS Jesus passed along, he saw a man who had*
 2 *been born blind. And his disciples asked him,*
saying, Rabbi, who sinned; this man or his pa-
 3 *rents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered,*
Neither this man nor his parents sinned. It
 4 *was only that the works of God might be dis-*
 5 *played upon him. I must do the work of him*
 6 *who sent me, while it is day; night cometh*
 7 *the blind man's eyes, and said to him, Go wash*
 8 *thine eyes in the pool of Siloam (which signi-*
 9 *fieth Sent⁴⁶.) He went therefore and washed*
 10 *them, and returned seeing.*

ch. 1; 9.

⁴⁶ In the Old Testament *Shiloah* and *Siloah*.

SECT. VII.

CH. 9.

8 *Then the neighbours, and they who had before
seen him blind, said, Is not this he who sat and
9 begged? Some said, It is he; others, He is like
10 him. He said, I am he. They asked him then,
11 How didst thou receive thy sight? He answered,
A man called Jesus, made clay and anointed
mine eyes, and said to me, 'Go to the pool of
'Siloam, and wash thine eyes.'* I went accord-
12 *ingly, and washed them, and saw. Then they
asked him, Where is he? He answered, I know
not.*

13 *Then they brought him who had been blind
14 to the Pharisees: (now it was on a Sabbath that
Jesus made the clay and gave him his sight.)
15 The Pharisees likewise, therefore, asked him
how he had received his sight. He answered, He
put clay on mine eyes, and I washed them, and
16 now see. Upon this some of the Pharisees said,
This man is not from God, for he observeth not
the Sabbath. Others said, How can one that is
a sinner perform such miracles? And they were
17 divided among themselves. Again they asked
the man who had been blind, What sayest thou
of him for giving thee sight? He answered, He
is a Prophet.*

18 *But the Jews believed not that the man had
been blind, and had received his sight, until they
19 called his parents and asked them, Do ye say
that this is your son who was born blind? How
20 then doth he now see? His parents answered,
We know that this is our son, and that he was
21 born blind; but how he now seeth we know
not. He is of age, ask him; he will answer for*

CH. 9.

SECT. VII.

- 22 himself. *His parents spoke thus, because they feared the Jews: for the Jews had already determined that whosoever acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah should be expelled the synagogue.*
- 23 *For this reason his parents said, "He is of age, "ask him."*
- 24 *A second time, therefore, they called the man who had been born blind, and said to him, Give glory to God; we know that this man is a sinner.*
- 25 *He replied, Whether he be a sinner, I know not: one thing I know, that I was blind, and now see. They said to him again, What did he to thee? How did he make thee see? He answered, I told you before, did ye not hear? Why would ye hear it repeated? Will ye also be his disciples? Then they reviled him and said, Thou art his disciple. As for us, we are disciples of Moses. We know that God spake to Moses; as for this man, we know not whence he is. The man replied, This is surprising, that ye know not whence he is, although he hath given me sight. We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man worship God, and obey him, that man he heareth. Never was it heard before, that any man gave sight to one born blind. If this man were not from God, he could do nothing. They replied, Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out.*
- 35 *Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and having met him, said to him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered, Who is he, Sir, that I may believe on him? Jesus said to*

SECT. VII.

CH. 10.

him, Not only hast thou seen him? but it is he
 38 who talketh with thee. *And he cried, Master,*
I believe, and threw himself prostrate before him.
 39 *And Jesus said,* For judgment am I come into
 this world, that they who see not, may see; and
 40 they who see, may become blind. *Some Phar-*
isees, who were present, hearing this, said to
 41 *him,* Are we also blind? *Jesus answered,* If ye
 were blind, ye would not have sin; but ye say,
 'We see,' therefore your sin remaineth.

X. Verily verily I say unto you, he who enter-
 eth not by the door into the sheep-fold, but
 climbeth over the fence, is a thief and a robber.
 2 The shepherd always entereth by the door.
 3 To him the door-keeper openeth, and the sheep
 obey his voice. His own sheep he calleth by
 4 name and leadeth out. And having put out his
 sheep, he walketh before them, and they follow
 5 him, because they know his voice. They will
 not follow a stranger, but flee from him, because
 6 they know not the voice of strangers. *Jesus*
addressed this similitude to them, but they did
 7 *not comprehend what he said. He therefore ad-*
ded, Verily verily I say unto you, I am the door
 8 of the fold. All who have entered [in another
 manner] are thieves and robbers, but the sheep
 9 obeyed them not. I am the door: such as en-
 ter by me shall be safe: they shall go in and
 10 out, and find pasture. The thief cometh only
 to steal, to slay, and to destroy. I am come
 that they may have life, and more than life.

CH. 10.

SECT. VII.

Is. 40; 11.
Eze. 34; 23,
& 37; 24.

11 I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd
 12 giveth his life for the sheep. The hireling, who
 is not the shepherd, and to whom the sheep do
 not belong, when he seeth the wolf coming,
 abandoneth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf
 13 teareth some and despereth the flock. The
 hireling fleeth, because he is a hireling, and
 14 careth not for the sheep. I am the good shep-
 15 herd. I both know my own, and am known by
 them; (even as the Father knoweth me, and I
 know the Father;) and I give my life for the
 16 sheep. I have other sheep besides, which are
 not of this fold. Them I must also bring; and
 they will obey my voice; and there shall be
 17 one flock, one shepherd. For this the Father
 loveth me, because I give my life, to be after-
 18 wards resumed. No one forceth it from me;
 but I give it of myself. I have power to give
 it, and I have power to resume it. This com-
 mission I have received from my Father.

Is. 53; 7.

Acts, 2; 24.

19 *Again there was a division among the Jews,*
 20 *occasioned by this discourse. Many of them*
said, He hath a demon and is mad, why do ye
 21 *hear him? Others said, These are not the words*
of a demoniac. Can a demon give sight to the
blind?

Mac. 4; 59.

22 *ONCE, when they were celebrating the feast*
of the dedication at Jerusalem, it being winter;
 23 *as Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's por-*
tico, the Jews surrounding him, said to him,
 24 *How long wilt thou keep us in suspense? If*
 25 *thou be the Messiah, tell us plainly. Jesus an-*

25 *swered*, I said to you, but ye believed not; 'the
 'works which I do in my Father's name testify
 26 'of me.' As for you, ye believe not, because
 27 ye are not of my sheep. 'My sheep,' as I told
 you, 'obey my voice;' I know them, and they
 28 follow me. Besides, I give them eternal life;
 and they shall never perish, neither shall any
 29 one wrest them out of my hands. My Father,
 who gave them me, is greater than all; and
 none can wrest them out of my Father's hand.
 30 I and the Father are one.

31 *Then the Jews again took up stones to stone*
 32 *him. Jesus said to them*, Many good works I
 have shown you from my Father; for which of
 33 these works do ye stone me? *The Jews answer-*
 34 *ed*, For a good work we do not stone thee; but
 for blasphemy, because thou, being a man, mak-
 35 est thyself God. *Jesus replied*, Is it not writ-
 36 ten in your law, "I said, ye are gods?" If the Ps. 82; 6.
 law stiled them gods to whom the word of God
 was addressed, and if the language of Scripture
 37 is unexceptionable; do ye charge him with
 blasphemy, whom the Father hath consecrated
 his Apostle to the world, for calling himself his
 38 Son? If I do not the works of my Father, be-
 lieve me not. But if I do, though ye believe
 not me, believe the works, that ye may know
 and believe that the Father is in me, and I am
 in him.

39 *Thereupon, they attempted again to seize him;*
 40 *but he escaped out of their hands, and retired*
again towards the Jordan, and abode in the
 41 *place where John first baptized. And many re-*

sorted to him, who said, John indeed wrought no miracle; but all that John spake of this man 42 is true. *And many believed on him there.*

SECTION VIII.

LAZARUS RAISED FROM THE DEAD.

ch. 12; 3.

XI. *NOW* one Lazarus of Bethany, the village of
 2 *Mary and her sister Martha, was sick. (It was that Mary who anointed the Lord with balsam, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother*
 3 *Lazarus was sick.) The sisters therefore sent to tell Jesus: Master, lo, he whom thou lovest*
 4 *is sick. Jesus hearing it, said, This sickness will not prove fatal, but conduce to the glory of God, that the son of God may be glorified*
 5 *thereby. Now Jesus loved Martha, and her*
 6 *sister, and Lazarus. Having then heard that he was sick, Jesus staid two days in the place where he was.*
 7 *Afterwards he said to the disciples, Let us*
 8 *return to Judea. The disciples answered, Rabbi, but very lately the Jews would have stoned*
 9 *thee, and wouldst thou return thither? Jesus replied, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If*
 any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, be-
 10 *cause he seeth the light of this world: but if he*

SECT. VIII.

CH. 11.

walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there
 11 is no light. *Having spoken this, he added, Our
 friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go to wake him.*
 12 *Then said his disciples, Master, if he sleep, he*
 13 *will recover. Jesus spake of his death; but*
they thought that he spoke of the repose of sleep.
 14 *Then Jesus told them plainly, Lazarus is dead.*
 And on your account I am glad that I was not
 there, that ye may believe; but let us go to
 16 him. *Then Thomas⁴⁷, that is Didymus⁴⁸, said*
to his fellow-disciples, Let us also go, that we
may die with him.

17 *When Jesus came, he found that Lazarus had*
 18 *been already four days in the tomb. (Now Betha-*
ny being but about fifteen furlongs⁴⁹ from Jeru-
 19 *salem,) many of the Jews came to Martha and*
Mary to comfort them on the death of their
 20 *brother. Martha having heard that Jesus was*
coming, went and met him; but Mary remained
 21 *in the house. Then Martha said to Jesus, Ma-*
 22 *ster, if thou hadst been here, my brother had*
 not died. But I know that even now, whatso-
 ever thou shalt ask of God, God will give thee.
 23 *Jesus said to her, Thy brother shall rise again.*
 24 *Martha replied, I know that he will rise again*
 25 *at the resurrection on the last day. Jesus said*
to her, I am the resurrection and the life. He
 who believeth on me, though he were dead,
 26 shall live; and no man who liveth and believeth
 27 on me, shall ever die. Believest thou this? *She*

Lu. 14; 14.
 ch. 5; 29.
 & 6; 40.

⁴⁷ Thomas in Chaldee, and ⁴⁸ Didymus in Greek, both signify twin.

⁴⁹ Near two miles.

CH. 11.

SECT. VIII.

answered, Yes, Master, I believe that thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, he who cometh
 28 *into the world. Having said this, she went and called Mary her sister, whispering her, The*
 29 *teacher is come, and calleth for thee. When Mary heard this, she instantly rose and went to*
 30 *him. Now Jesus had not yet entered the vil-*
 31 *lage, but was in the place where Martha met*
 32 *him. The Jews, then, who were condoling with Mary in the house, when they saw that she arose*
 33 *hastily, and went out, followed her, saying, She is going to the tomb to weep there. Mary be-*
 34 *ing come to the place where Jesus was, and see-*
 35 *ing him, threw herself at his feet, saying, Hadst thou been here, Master, my brother had not*
 36 *died. When Jesus saw her weeping, and the*
 37 *Jews weeping who came with her, he groaned*
 38 *deeply, and was troubled, and said, Where have*
 39 *ye laid him? They answered and said, Master, come and see. Jesus wept. The Jews therefore*
 40 *said, Mark how he loved him. But some of*
 41 *them said, Could not he who gave sight to the*
 42 *blind man, even prevented this man's death? Jesus therefore again groaning came to the mon-*
 43 *ument. It was a cave, the entrance whereof was*
 44 *shut up with a stone. Jesus said, Remove the*
 45 *stone. Martha, the sister of the deceased, an-*
 46 *swered, Sir, by this time the smell is offensive,*
 47 *for this is the fourth day. Jesus replied, Said*
 48 *I not unto thee, 'If thou believe, thou shalt see*
 49 *'the glory of God?' Then they removed the*
 50 *stone. And Jesus lifting up his eyes, said, Fa-*
 51 *ther, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. As*

ch. 9 ; 1.

SECT. VIII.

CH. 11.

for me, I know that thou hearest me always ;
 but I speak for the people's sake who surround
 me, that they may believe that thou hast sent
 43 me. *After these words, raising his voice, he*
 44 *cried, Lazarus, come forth. And he who had*
been dead came forth, bound hand and foot with
fillets, and his face wrapped in a handkerchief.
Jesus said to them, Unbind him, and let him go.
 45 *Many therefore of the Jews who had come to*
Mary, and seen what Jesus did, believed on him.
 46 *But some of them repaired to the pharisees, and*
told them what Jesus had done.
 47 *Whereupon the chief priests and the pharisees*
assembled the sanhedrim, and said, What are
 48 *we doing ? for this man worketh many miracles.*
If we let him go on thus, every body will be-
lieve on him, and the Romans will come and
 49 *destroy both our place and nation. One of them* ch. 13 ; 14.
named Caiaphas, who was high priest that year,
 50 *said to them, Ye are utterly at a loss, and do*
not consider, that it is better for us that one
man die for the people, than that the whole na-
 51 *tion should be ruined. This he spake, not of*
himself, but being high priest that year, he pro-
phesied that Jesus should die for the nation ;
 52 *and not for that nation only, but that he should*
assemble into one body, the dispersed children
 53 *of God. From that day, therefore, they concert-*
 54 *ed how they might destroy him. For this rea-*
son Jesus appeared no longer publicly among
the Jews, but retired to the country, near the de-
sert, to a city called Ephraim, and continued
there with his disciples.

55 *Meantime the Jewish passover approached, and many went to Jerusalem from the country,*
 56 *before the passover, to purify themselves. These inquired after Jesus, and said one to another, as they stood in the temple, What think ye? Will*
 57 *he not come to the festival? Now the chief priests and the pharisees had issued an order that whosoever knew where he was, should discover it, that they might apprehend him.*

XII. *SIX days before the passover Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom he had*
 2 *raised from the dead. There they made him a supper, and Martha served: but Lazarus was*
 3 *one of those who were at table with him. Then Mary taking a pound of the balsam of spikenard, which was very valuable, anointed the feet of*
Jesus, and wiped them with her hair, so that the house was filled with the odour of the balsam.
 4 *Whereupon one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot,*
 5 *Simon's son, who was to betray him, said, Why was not this balsam sold for three hundred denarii⁵⁰, which might have been given to the*
 6 *poor? This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the*
 7 *purse, and carried what was put therein. Then Jesus said, Let her alone. She hath reserved this to embalm me against the day of my burial.*
 8 *For ye will always have the poor amongst you; but me ye will not always have.*

⁵⁰ Above 9l. sterling.

9 *A great number of the Jews, knowing where*
he was, flocked thither, not on account of Jesus
only, but likewise to see Lazarus whom he had
 10 *raised from the dead. The chief priests, there-*
 11 *fore, determined to kill Lazarus also; because*
he proved the occasion that many Jews forsook
them, and believed on Jesus.

 SECTION IX.

THE ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

12 *ON the morrow a great multitude who were* Mat. 21; 6.
come to the festival, hearing that Jesus was on Mar. 11; 7.
 13 *the road to Jerusalem, took branches of palm-* Lu. 19; 35.
trees, and went to meet him, crying, Hosanna⁵¹,
blessed be Israel's King who cometh in the
 14 *name of the Lord⁵². Now Jesus having found*
a young ass, was riding thereon, agreeably to
 15 *what is written, "Fear not, daughter of Zion; Zech. 9; 9.*
"behold thy king cometh, sitting on an ass's
 16 *"colt." These things the disciples did not un-*
derstand at first; but after Jesus was glorified,
they remembered that thus it had been written

⁵¹ Save now I pray.

⁵² Jehovah.

CH. 12.

SECT. IX.

concerning him, and that thus they had done unto him. And the people who had been present attested that he called Lazarus out of the tomb, and raised him from the dead. It was the rumour that he had wrought this miracle, which made the people crowd to meet him. The pharisees therefore said among themselves, Are ye not sensible that ye have no influence? Behold the world is gone after him.

Now among those who came to worship at the festival, there were some Greeks. These applied to Philip of Bethsaida in Galilee, making this request, Sir, we wish to see Jesus. Philip went and told Andrew: then Andrew and Philip told Jesus.

Jesus answered them, saying, The time is come when the Son of Man must be glorified. Verily verily I say unto you, when a grain of wheat is thrown into the ground, unless it die, it remaineth single; but if it die, it becometh very fruitful. He who loveth his life, shall lose it; and he who hateth his life in this world, shall preserve it eternally in the next. Would any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant also be. If any man serve me, my Father will reward him.

Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? [Shall I say] 'Father, save me from this hour?' But I came on purpose for this hour. Father, glorify thy name. Then came a voice from heaven, which said, I have both glorified, and will again glorify it. The people present heard the sound, and said, It thundered: others

Mar. 10; 39.
& 26; 25.
Mar. 8; 35.
Lu. 9; 24.
& 17; 33.

SECT. IX.

CH. 12.

30 *said*, An angel spake to him. *Jesus said*, This voice came not for my sake, but for yours.

31 Now must this world be judged. Now must

32 the prince of this world be cast out. As for me, when I shall be lifted up from the earth, I

33 will draw all men to myself. *This he said al-*

34 *luding to the death which he was to suffer. The people answered*, We have learnt from the law that the Messiah will live for ever. How sayest thou then that the Son of Man must be lifted

35 up? Who is this, the Son of Man? *Jesus said to them*, Yet a little while the light continueth with you; walk, while ye have it, lest darkness overtake you: for he that walketh in darkness

36 knoweth not whither he goeth. Confide in the light, while ye enjoy it, that ye may be sons of light. *Having spoken these words, he withdrew himself privately from them.*

37 *But though he had performed so many miracles before them, they believed not on him; so that the word of the Prophet Isaiah was verified,* “Lord, who hath believed our report?” and “To

38 *whom is the arm of the Lord*⁵³ *discovered?”*

39 *For this reason they could not believe; Isaiah having said also,* “He hath blinded their eyes, and

40 *blunted their understanding, that they might not see with their eyes, comprehend with their un-*

41 *derstanding, and repent, that I might reclaim them.” These things said Isaiah, when he saw his*

Ps. 110; 4.
Ez. 37; 25.Is. 53; 1.
Ro. 10; 16.Is. 6; 9.
Mat. 13; 14.
Mar. 4; 12.
Lu. 8; 10.
Acts, 28; 26.
Ro. 11; 8.⁵³ Jehovah.

CH. 13.

SECT. IX.

42 *glory and spake concerning him. Nevertheless there were several even of the magistrates who believed on him, but, for fear of the pharisees, did not avow it, lest they should be expelled the*

ch. 5 ; 44.

43 *synagogue ; for they preferred the approbation of men to the approbation of God.*

44 *Then Jesus raising his voice, said, He who believeth on me, it is not on me he believeth,*

45 *but on him who sent me. And he who behold-*

ch. 1 ; 4.

46 *eth me, beholdeth him who sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me, may not remain in darkness.*

47 *And if any man hear my words, but do not observe them ; it is not I who condemn him ; for I came, not to condemn the world, but to save*

ch. 3 ; 17.
Mar. 16 ; 16.

48 *the world. He who despiseth me and rejecteth my instructions, hath what condemneth him.*

The doctrine which I have taught will condemn

49 *him at the last day. For I have not said any thing from myself, but the Father who sent me, hath commanded me, what I should enjoin, and*

50 *what I should teach. And I know that his commandment is eternal life. Whatever therefore I say, I speak as the Father hath given me in charge.*

XIII. *Jesus having, before the feast of the pass-over, perceived that his time to remove out of this world to his Father was come, and having loved his own who were in the world, loved them*
2 *to the last. Now while they were at supper (the devil having already put into the heart of*

Mat. 26 ; 2.
Mar. 14 ; 1.
Lu. 22 ; 1.

SECT. IX.

CH. 13.

Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him,)
 3 *Jesus, though he knew that the Father had sub-*
jected every thing to him, and that he came from
 4 *God, and was returning to God, arose from sup-*
per, and laying aside his mantle, girt himself
 5 *about with a towel. Then he poured water into*
the bason, and began to wash the feet of the dis-
ciples, and to wipe them with the towel where-
with he was girded.
 6 *When he came to Simon Peter, Peter said to*
 7 *him, Master, wouldst thou wash my feet? Jesus*
answered, At present thou dost not comprehend
what I am doing; but thou shalt know hereaf-
 8 *ter. Peter replied, Thou shalt never wash my*
feet. Jesus answered, Unless I wash thee, thou
 9 *canst have no part with me. Simon Peter said*
to him, Master, not my feet only, but also my
 10 *hands and my head. Jesus replied, He who*
hath been bathing, needeth only to wash his
feet; the rest of his body being clean. Ye are
 11 *clean, but not all. For he knew who would be-*
tray him; therefore he said, 'Ye are not all
'clean.'
 12 *After he had washed their feet, he put on his*
mantle, and replacing himself at the table, said
to them, Do ye understand what I have been
 13 *doing to you? Ye call me the Teacher and the*
 14 *Master; and ye say right; for so I am. If I*
then, the Master and the Teacher, have washed
your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's
 15 *feet. For I have given you an example that*
 16 *ye should do as I have done unto you. Verily*
verily I say unto you, the servant is not greater

Mat. 10 ; 24.
 Lu. 6 ; 40.
 ch. 15 ; 20.

CH. 13.

SECT. IX.

than his master, nor the apostle greater than he
17 who sendeth him. Happy are ye who know
these things, provided ye practise them.

Ps. 41 ; 9.

18 I speak not of you all. I know whom I have
chosen ; but that Scripture must be fulfilled,
“ He that eateth at my table, has lifted his heel

Mat. 10 ; 40.
Lu. 10 ; 16.

19 “ against me.” I tell you this now before it
happen, that when it happeneth, ye may be-
20 lieve that I am the person. Verily verily I say
unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I
send, receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me,
receiveth him who sent me.

Mat. 26 ; 21.
Mar. 14 ; 18.
Lu. 22 ; 21.

21 *After uttering these words, Jesus was troubled
in spirit, and declared, saying, Verily verily I
say unto you, that one of you will betray me.*

22 *Then the disciples looked one upon another,
23 doubting of whom he spake. Now one of his
disciples, one whom Jesus loved, was lying close*

24 *to his breast : Simon Peter, therefore, beckoned
25 to him to inquire whom he meant. He then re-
clining on Jesus' bosom, said to him, Master,*

26 *who is it? Jesus answered, It is he to whom I
shall give this morsel, after I have dipped it.*

*And having dipped the morsel, he gave it to
27 Judas Iscariot, Simon's son. After receiv-
ing the morsel, Satan entered into him. Then*

*Jesus said to him, What thou dost, do quick-
28 ly. But none at the table knew why he gave*

*this order. Some imagined, because Judas
had the purse, that Jesus had signified to him*

*to buy necessaries for the festival, or to give
30 something to the poor. When Judas had*

CH. 13.

SECT. IX.

taken the morsel, he immediately went out : and it was night.

31 *When he was gone, Jesus said, The Son of Man is now glorified, and God is glorified by*
 32 *him. If God be glorified by him, God also will glorify him by himself, and that without delay.*

33 *My children, I have now but a little time to be with you. Ye will seek me ; and what I said to the Jews, “ Whither I go, ye cannot come,”*

34 *I say at present to you. A new commandment I give you, that ye love one another ; that as I*
 35 *have loved you, ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

36 *Simon Peter said to him, Master, whither art thou going? Jesus answered, Whither I am going thou canst not follow me now, but after-*
 37 *wards thou shalt follow me. Peter replied, Master, why cannot I follow thee presently?*

38 *I will lay down my life for thy sake. Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily verily I say unto thee, the cock shall not crow, until thou hast disowned me thrice.*

ch. 7 ; 34.
 ch. 15 ; 12.
 17.
 Eph. 5 ; 2.

Mat. 26 ; 34.
 Mar. 14 ; 30.
 Lu. 22 ; 33.

SECTION X.

CONSOLATION TO THE DISCIPLES.

XIV. LET not your heart be troubled ; believe
2 on God, and believe on me. In my Father's
house are many mansions. If it were other-
wise, I would have told you. I go to prepare
3 a place for you : and after I shall have gone
and prepared a place for you, I will return and
take you with me, that where I am, there ye
4 also may be. And whither I am going ye
5 know, and the way ye know. *Thomas said to
him, Master, we know not whither thou art go-*
6 *ing. How, then, can we know the way ? Jesus*
answered, I am the way, and the truth, and the
life : no man cometh unto the Father, but by
7 *me. Had ye known me, ye would have known*
my Father also ; and henceforth ye know him,
and have seen him.
8 *Philip said unto him, Master, show us the*
9 *Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus replied,*
Have I been with you so long, and dost thou
not yet know me, Philip ? He that hath seen
me, hath seen the Father. How sayest thou
10 *then, " Show us the Father ? " Dost thou not*
believe that I am in the Father, and the Fa-
ther is in me ? The words which I speak to

SECT. X.

CH. 14.

you, proceed not from myself : as to the works, it is the Father dwelling in me who doth them.

11 Believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me ; if not on my testimony, be con-
 12 vinced by the works themselves. Verily verily I say unto you, He who believeth on me, shall himself do such works as I do ; nay
 13 even greater than these he shall do ; because I go to my Father, and will do whatsoever ye shall ask in my name. That the Father may
 14 be glorified in the Son, whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do.

Mat. 7 ; 7
 & 21 ; 22.
 Mar. 11 ; 23
 ch. 16 ; 23

15 If ye love me, keep my commandments ;
 16 and I will entreat the Father, and he will give you another Monitor to continue with you for
 17 ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither seeth him, nor knoweth him ; but ye shall know him, because he will abide with you, and be in you.
 18 I will not leave you orphans ; I will return
 19 unto you. Yet a little while, and the world shall see me no more ; but ye shall see me ;
 20 because I shall live, ye also shall live. On that day ye shall know that I am in my Father,
 21 and ye are in me, and I am in you. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is who loveth me ; and he who loveth me will be loved of my Father, and I will love
 22 him, and discover myself unto him. *Judas (not Iscariot) said to him, Master, wherefore wilt thou discover thyself to us, and not unto*
 23 *the world ? Jesus answering, said unto him, If a man love me, he will observe my word ; and my Father will love him ; and we will come to*

CH. 15.

SECT. X.

24 him, and dwell with him. He who loveth me not, disregardeth my words; yet the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me.

25 I tell you these things while I remain with
 26 you. But the Monitor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name; he will teach you all things, and remind you of all that
 27 I have told you. Peace I leave you, my peace I give you; not as the world giveth, do I give unto you. Be not disheartened; be not intimid-
 28 idated. Ye have heard me say, 'I go away
 'and will return to you.' If ye loved me, ye would rejoice that I go to the Father; because
 29 my Father is greater than I. This I tell you now before it happen, that when it happeneth,
 30 ye may believe. I shall not henceforth have much conversation with you; for the prince of the world is coming, though he will find
 31 nothing in me; but this must be, that the world may know that I love the Father, and do whatsoever he commandeth me. Arise, let us go hence.

XV. I AM the true vine, and my Father is the
 2 vine-dresser. Every barren branch in me he loppeth off: every fruitful branch he cleaneth
 3 by pruning, to render it more fruitful. As for you, ye are already clean through the instruc-
 4 tions I have given you. Abide in me, and I will abide in you: as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it adhere to the vine; no
 5 more can ye, unless ye adhere to me. I am the vine; ye are the branches. He who abid-

SECT. X.

cII. 15.

eth in me, and in whom I abide, produceth much fruit: for severed from me ye can do
6 nothing. If any man adhere not to me, he is cast forth like the withered branches which are
7 gathered for fewel, and burnt. If ye abide by me, and my words abide in you, ye may ask what ye will, and it shall be granted you.

8 Herein is my Father glorified, that ye produce much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.

9 As the Father loveth me, so love I you: continue in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall continue in my love; as I have kept my Father's commandments, and continue

11 in his love. I give you these admonitions, that I may continue to have joy in you, and that

12 your joy may be complete: this is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I love

ch. 13; 34.
Eph. 5; 2.
1 Th. 4; 9.

13 you. Greater love hath not any man than this, to lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends, if ye do whatever I command you.

15 Henceforth I call not you servants; for the servant knoweth not what his master will do; but I name you friends: for whatever I have

16 learnt from my Father, I impart unto you. It is not you who have chosen me; but it is I who have chosen you, and ordained you to go and bear fruit, fruit which will prove permanent, that the Father may give you whatsoever ye shall ask him in my name.

Mar. 3; 13.
Lu. 6; 13.

17 This I command you, that ye love one another.
18 er. If the world hate you, consider that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own. But

1 Jo. 3; 11.
& 4; 7.

Mat. 10 ; 24.
Lu. 6 ; 40.
ch. 13 ; 16.

because ye are not of the world, I having selected you from the world; the world hateth you. Remember what I said to you, 'The servant is not greater than his master.' If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have observed my word, they will also observe yours. But all this treatment they will give you, on my account, because they know not him who sent me. If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them such works as none other ever did, they had not had sin; but now they have seen them, and yet hated both me and my Father. Thus they verify that passage in their law, "They hated me without cause." But when the Monitor is come, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceedeth from the Father, he will testify concerning me. And ye also will testify, because ye have been with me from the beginning.

Ps. 35 ; 19.
Lu. 24 ; 49.

XVI. These things I tell you, that ye may not be ensnared. They will expel you the synagogue; nay, the time is coming, when whosoever killeth you, will think he offereth sacrifice to God. And these things they will do because they know not the Father nor me. These things I now warn you of, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I mentioned them to you. I did not indeed mention them at the beginning, because I was with you myself.

SECT. X.

CH. 16.

- 5 And now that I go to him who sent me, none of
6 you asketh me, ' Whither goest thou ?' But be-
cause of those things which I have foretold
you, ye are overwhelmed with grief.
- 7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth ; it is for
your good that I depart ; for if I do not depart,
the Monitor will not come to you ; but if I go
8 away, I will send him to you. And when he is
come, he will convince the world concerning
sin, and concerning righteousness, and concern-
9 ing judgment : concerning sin, because they
10 believe not on me ; concerning righteousness,
because I go to my Father, and ye see me
11 no longer ; concerning judgment, because the
prince of this world is judged.
- 12 I have many things still to tell you, but ye
13 cannot yet bear them. But when the Spirit of
Truth is come, he will conduct you into all the
truth : for his words will not proceed from him-
self : but whatsoever he shall have heard, he
14 will speak, and show you things to come. He
will glorify me : for he will receive of mine what
15 he shall communicate to you. Whatsoever
is the Father's is mine ; therefore I say that he
will receive of mine to communicate to you.
- 16 Within a little while ye shall not see me ; a
little while after ye shall see me ; because I go
17 to the Father. *Some of his disciples said
among themselves,* What meaneth he by this,
" Within a little while ye shall not see me : a
" little while after ye shall see me : because I go
18 " to the Father ?" What meaneth this little
while of which he speaketh ? We do not com-
19 prehend it. *Jesus perceiving that they were*

desirous to ask him, said to them, Do ye inquire amongst yourselves about this that I said, "With-
 " in a little while ye shall not see me : a little
 20 " while after ye shall see me ?" Verily verily I say unto you, ye will weep and lament, but the world will rejoice : ye will be sorrowful ; but
 21 your sorrow shall be turned into joy. A woman in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come. But when her son is born, she remembereth her anguish no longer, for joy that she
 22 hath brought a man into the world. So ye at present are in grief ; but I will visit you again, and your hearts shall be joyful, and none shall
 23 rob you of your joy. On that day ye will put no questions to me. Verily verily I say unto you ; whatsoever ye shall ask the Father
 24 in my name, he will give you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name ; ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be complete.
 25 These things I have spoken to you in figures : the time approacheth when I shall no more discourse to you in figures, but instruct
 26 you plainly concerning the Father. Then ye will ask in my name, and I say not that I
 27 will entreat the Father for you : for the Father himself loveth you, because ye love me, and
 28 believe that I came from God. From the presence of the Father I came into the world. Again I leave the world, and return to the
 29 Father. *His disciples replied,* Now indeed thou speakest plainly, and without a figure.
 30 Now we are convinced that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any should put

questions to thee. By this we believe that
 31 thou camest forth from God. *Jesus answered* Mat. 26 ; 31.
 32 *them*, Do ye now believe? Behold the time Mar. 14 ; 27.
 cometh, or rather is come, when ye shall dis-
 perse, every one to his own, and shall leave
 me alone ; yet I am not alone, because the Fa-
 33 ther is with me. These things I have spoken
 unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In
 the world ye shall have tribulation. But take
 courage ! I have overcome the world.

XVII. *WHEN* *Jesus had ended this discourse, he*
said, lifting up his eyes to heaven, Father, the
hour is come ; glorify thy Son, that thy Son
 2 *also may glorify thee ; that being endowed by* Mat. 28 ; 18.
 thee with authority over all men, he may be-
 stow eternal life on all those whom thou hast
 3 given him. Now this is the life eternal, to
 know thee the only true God, and Jesus the
 4 Messiah thy apostle. I have glorified thee
 upon the earth ; I have finished the work which
 5 thou gavest me to do. And now, Father, glo-
 rify thou me in thine own presence with that
 glory which I enjoyed with thee before the
 world was.

6 I have made known thy name to the men
 whom thou hast given me out of the world.
 They were thine ; and thou gavest them me ;
 7 and they have kept thy word. Whatsoever
 thou hast given me, they now know to have
 8 come from thee ; and that thou hast imparted
 unto me the doctrine which I have imparted
 unto them. They have received it [as such,] ch. 16 ; 27.

CH. 17.

SECT. X.

knowing for certain, that I came forth from thee,
 9 and am commissioned by thee. It is for them
 that I pray. I pray not for the world, but for
 those whom thou hast given me, because they
 10 are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine
 11 mine, and I am glorified in them. I continue
 no longer in the world; but these continue in
 the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father,
 preserve them in thy name which thou hast
 given me, that they may be one as we are.
 12 While I was with them in the world, I kept
 them in thy name; those whom thou hast given
 me I have preserved. None of them is lost,
 except the son of perdition, as the Scripture
 13 foretold. But now that I am coming to thee, I
 speak these things in the world, that their joy
 14 in me may be complete. I have delivered thy
 word to them, and the world hateth them, be-
 cause they are not of the world, even as I am
 15 not of the world. I do not pray thee to re-
 move them out of the world, but to preserve
 16 them from evil. Of the world they are not,
 17 as I am not of the world. Consecrate them by
 18 the truth; thy word is the truth. As thou hast
 made me thy apostle to the world, I have made
 19 them my apostles to the world. And I conse-
 crate myself for them, that they may be conse-
 crated through the truth.
 20 Nor do I pray for these alone, but for those
 also who shall believe on me through their
 21 teaching; that all may be one; that as thou Fa-
 ther art in me, and I am in thee, they also may
 be one in us, that the world may believe that
 22 thou hast sent me; and that thou gavest me the

ch. 18; 9.

SECT. XI.

CH. 18.

glory which I have given them ; that they may
 23 be one as we are one ; I in them, and thou in
 me, that their union may be perfected, and that
 the world may know that thou hast sent me,
 and that thou lovest them as thou lovest me.
 24 Father, I would that where I shall be, those ch. 12 ; 26
 whom thou hast given me may be with me, that
 they may behold my glory which thou gavest
 me, because thou lovedst me before the forma-
 25 tion of the world. Righteous Father, though
 the world knoweth not thee, I know thee ; and
 26 these know that I have thy commission. And
 to them I have communicated, and will commu-
 nicate, thy name, that I being in them, they may
 share in the love wherewith thou lovest me.

SECTION XI.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

XVIII. *WHEN* Jesus had spoken these words, he
 passed with his disciples over the brook Kidron,
 where was a garden, into which he entered and
 2 his disciples. Now Judas who betrayed him
 knew the place, because Jesus often resorted
 3 thither with his disciples. Then Judas having
 gotten the cohort⁵⁴, and officers from the chief
 priests and the pharisees, came thither with

Mat. 26 ; 47.
 Mar. 14 ; 43.
 Lu. 22 ; 47.

⁵⁴ A Roman troop of soldiers, containing about five hundred.

CH. 18.

SECT. XI.

4 lanterns and torches, and arms. But Jesus, who knew all that was coming upon him, went
 5 forth and said to them, whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus the Nazarene. Jesus replied, I am he. Now Judas who betrayed him
 6 was with them. He had no sooner said to them, "I am he," than they going backwards fell to
 7 the ground. He therefore asked them again, Whom seek ye? They said, Jesus the Naza-
 8 rene. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he. If, therefore, ye seek me, let these go
 9 away. Thus was that which he had spoken verified, "of those whom thou gavest me I have
 10 "lost none." Then Simon Peter, who had a sword, drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. Now the ser-
 11 vant's name was Malchus. Jesus then said to Peter, Put up the sword into the scabbard. Shall I not drink the cup which the Father hath given me?

ch. 17; 12.

12 Then the cohort⁵⁴ and their commander, and
 13 the Jewish officers, apprehended Jesus, and having bound him, brought him first to Annas⁵⁵, because he was father-in-law to Caiaphas who was
 14 high priest that year. Now it was Caiaphas who had said in council to the Jews, "It is expedient that one man die for the people."

ch. 11; 50.

Mat. 26; 58.
 Mar. 14; 54.
 Lu. 22; 54.

15 Meantime Simon Peter and another disciple followed Jesus. That disciple being known to the high priest, entered his court-yard with

⁵⁴ A Roman troop of soldiers, containing about five hundred.

⁵⁵ Called by Josephus *Ananus*.

SECT. XI.

CH. 18.

16 *Jesus. But Peter stood without at the door. Therefore the other disciple who was known to the high priest, went out and spoke to the portress, and brought in Peter. Then this maid the portress, said to Peter, Art not thou also one of this man's disciples? He answered, I am*

17 *not. Now the servants and the officers stood near a fire which they had made, because it was cold, and warmed themselves. And Peter was standing with them, and warming himself.*

19 *Then the high priest interrogated Jesus concerning his disciples and his doctrine. Jesus answered, I spake openly to the world; I always taught in the synagogues and in the temple, whither the Jews constantly resort. I said nothing in secret. Why examinest thou me? Examine them who heard me teach.*

21 *They know what I said. When he had spoken thus, one of the officers who attended, gave him a blow and said, Answerest thou thus the high*

22 *priest? Jesus replied, If I have spoken amiss, show wherein it is amiss; if well, why smitest*

23 *thou me? Now Annas⁵⁵ had sent him bound to Caiaphas the high priest.*

Mat. 26; 57.
Mar. 14; 53.

25 *As Peter stood warming himself, they asked him, Art not thou also one of his disciples? He*

26 *denied it and said, I am not. One of the servants of the high priest, a kinsman to him, whose ear Peter had cut off, said, Did not I see thee*

Mat. 26; 69.
Mar. 14; 67.
Lu. 22; 55.

⁵⁵ Called by Josephus *Ananus*.

27 in the garden with him? *Peter denied again, and immediately the cock crew.*

Mat. 27 ; 1.
Mar. 15 ; 1.
Lu. 23 ; 1.
Acts. 10 ; 28.
& 11 ; 3.

28 *THEN they led Jesus from the house of Caiaphas to the pretorium⁵⁶ : it was now morning ; but the Jews entered not the pretorium⁵⁶, lest they should be defiled, and so not in a con-*

29 *dition to eat the passover. Pilate, therefore, went out to them and said, Of what do ye ac-*

30 *cuse this man ? They answered, If he were not a criminal, we would not have delivered him to*

31 *thee. Pilate, therefore, said, Take him yourselves then, and judge him according to your law. The Jews replied, We are not permitted*

Mat. 20 ; 19.

32 *to put any man to death. And thus what Jesus had spoken, signifying what death he should die, was accomplished.*

Mat. 27 ; 11.
Mar. 15 ; 2.
Lu. 23 ; 3.

33 *Then Pilate returned to the pretorium⁵⁶, and having called Jesus, said to him, Thou art*
34 *the king of the Jews ? Jesus answered, Sayest thou this of thyself ? or did others tell thee so*
35 *concerning me ? Pilate replied, Am I a Jew ? Thine own nation, yea, the chief priests have delivered thee to me. What hast thou done ?*

36 *Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my adherents would have fought to prevent my falling into the hands of the Jews ; but my kingdom is not hence. Pilate thereupon said, Thou art king then ? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am king. For this I was born ; and for*

⁵⁶ Procurator's palace, or hall of audience.

SECT. XI.

CH. 19.

this I came into the world, to give testimony to the truth. Whosoever is of the truth, harken-
 38 eth to me. *Pilate asked him, What is truth? and so saying, went out again to the Jews, and said to them, For my part, I find nothing culpa-*
 39 *ble in this man. But, since it is customary that I release to you one at the passover, will ye that I release to you the king of the Jews?*
 40 *Then they all cried, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber.*

Mat. 27 ; 15.
 Mar. 15 ; 6.
 Lu. 23 ; 17.

Acts. 3 ; 4.

XIX. *Then Pilate caused him to be scourged. And the soldiers crowned him with a wreath of thorn which they had platted ; and having thrown a*
 3 *purple mantle about him, said, Hail ! king of the*
 4 *Jews, and gave him blows on the face. Pilate, therefore, went out again and said to them, Lo, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that*
 5 *I find in him nothing culpable. Jesus then went forth wearing the crown of thorns and the purple*
 6 *mantle ; and Pilate said to them, Behold the man ! When the chief priests and the officers saw him, they cried, saying, Crucify, Crucify him. Pilate said to them, Take him yourselves and*
 7 *crucify him ; as for me, I find no fault in him. The Jews answered, We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he assumed the title of Son of God.*
 8 *When Pilate heard this, he was the more*
 9 *afraid, and having returned to the pretorium, said to Jesus, Whence art thou ? But Jesus*
 10 *gave him no answer. Then Pilate said to him, Wilt thou not speak unto me ? Knowest thou*

Mat. 27 ; 27.
 Mar. 15 ; 15.

not that I have power to crucify thee, and power to release thee? *Jesus replied*, Thou couldst have no power over me, unless it were given thee from above; wherefore he who delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. *Thenceforth Pilate sought to release him; but the Jews exclaimed*, If thou release this man, thou art not Cesar's friend. Whoever calleth himself king, opposeth Cesar.

13 *Pilate, on hearing these words, ordered Jesus to be brought forth, and sat down on the tribunal in a place named the pavement, in Hebrew Gabbatha*⁵⁷. (*Now it was the preparation*⁵⁸ *of the paschal Sabbath, about the sixth hour*⁵⁹.) *And he said to the Jews*, Behold your king. *But they cried out*, Away, away with him, crucify him. 16 *Pilate said to them*, Shall I crucify your king? *The chief priests answered*, We have no king but Cesar. *He delivered him, therefore, to them to be crucified.*

Mat. 27; 33.
Mar. 15; 22.
Lu. 23; 33.

17 *Then they took Jesus and led him away. And he carrying his cross, went out to a place called the place of skulls*⁶⁰, *which is in Hebrew Golgotha, where they crucified him and two others with him, one on each side, and Jesus in the middle. Pilate also wrote a title, and put it upon the cross. The words were, JESUS THE NAZARENE, THE KING OF THE JEWS.* 20 *And many of the Jews read this title (for the place*

⁵⁷ A raised place.

⁵⁸ Friday.

⁵⁹ Twelve o'clock noon.

⁶⁰ Vul. Calvary.

SECT. XI.

CH. 19.

where Jesus was crucified was nigh the city ;
 and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and
 21 Latin ;) whereupon the chief priests said to Pi-
 late, Write not " the king of the Jews," but
 22 " who calleth himself king of the Jews." Pi-
 late answered, What I have written, I have
 written.

23 When the soldiers had nailed Jesus to the Mat. 27 ; 35.
 cross, they took his mantle, and divided it into Mat. 15 ; 24.
 four parts, one to every soldier : they also took Lu. 23 ; 34.
 the coat, which was seamless, woven from the
 24 top throughout, and said among themselves, Let
 us not tear it, but determine by lot whose it
 shall be ; thereby verifying the Scripture which
 saith, " They shared my mantle among them, Ps. 22 ; 18.
 " and cast lots for my vesture." Thus there-
 fore acted the soldiers.

25 Now there stood near the cross of Jesus, his
 mother, and her sister Mary the wife of Cleo-
 26 phas, and Mary Magdalene. Then Jesus ob-
 serving his mother, and the disciple whom he
 loved standing by, said to his mother, Woman,
 27 behold thy son. Then he said to the disciple,
 Behold thy mother. And from that hour the
 disciple took her to his own home.

28 After this Jesus, knowing that all was now
 accomplished ; that the Scripture might be ful-
 29 filled, said, I thirst. As there was a vessel Ps. 69 ; 21.
 there full of vinegar, they filled a sponge with
 vinegar, and having fastened it to a twig of
 30 hyssop, held it to his mouth. When Jesus had
 received the vinegar, he said, It is finished, and
 bowing his head, yielded up his spirit.

- 31 *The Jews, therefore, lest the bodies should remain on the cross on the Sabbath⁶¹, for it was the preparation⁶² (and that Sabbath was a great day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and the bodies might be removed.*
- 32 *Accordingly the soldiers came and broke the legs of the first, and of the other who were crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and found that he was already dead, they did*
- 33 *not break his legs. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, whence blood and wa-*
- 34 *ter immediately issued. He was an eye-witness who attesteth this, and his testimony deserveth credit: nay, he is conscious that he speaketh*
- 35 *truth, that ye may believe. For these things happened that the Scripture might be verified,*
- 36 *“None of his bones shall be broken.” Again, the Scripture saith elsewhere, “They shall look*
- 37 *“on him whom they have pierced.”*

Ex. 12; 46.
Num. 9; 12.
Zec. 12; 10.

SECTION XII.

THE RESURRECTION.

Mat. 27; 57.
Mar. 15; 43.
Lu. 23; 50.
ch. 3; 1.

- 38 *AFTER this Joseph the Arimathean, who was a disciple of Jesus, but a concealed disciple, for fear of the Jews, asked permission of Pilate to*

⁶¹ Saturday:

⁶² Friday:

SECT. XII.

CH. 20.

take away the body of Jesus; which Pilate having granted, he went and took the body of
 39 Jesus. Nicodemus also, who had formerly repaired to Jesus by night, came and brought a
 mixture of myrrh and aloes, weighing about a
 40 hundred pounds. These men took the body of
 Jesus, and wound it in linen rollers with the
 spices, which is the Jewish manner of embalm-
 41 ing. Now in the place where he was crucified
 there was a garden, and in the garden a new
 monument wherein no one had ever yet been laid.
 42 There they deposited Jesus on account of the
 Jewish preparation⁶³, the monument being near.

XX. The first day of the week⁶⁴ Mary Magda-
 lene went early to the monument, while it was
 yet dark, and saw that the stone had been re-
 2 moved from the entrance. Then she came run-
 ning to Simon Peter, and to that other disciple
 whom Jesus loved, and said to them, They have
 taken the Master out of the monument, and
 3 we know not where they have laid him. Im-
 mediately Peter went out, and the other disci-
 4 ple, to go to the monument. And both ran to-
 gether, but the other disciple out-ran Peter, and
 5 came first to the monument; and stooping down,
 he saw the linen rollers lying, but went not in.
 6 Then came Simon Peter, who followed him,
 7 and went into the monument, where he observed
 the rollers lying, and the handkerchief which
 had been wrapped about his head, not laid be-
 side them, but folded up in a place by itself.

Mat. 28; 1.
 Mar. 16; 1.
 Lu. 24; 1.

⁶³ Friday.⁶⁴ Sunday.

8 *Then the other disciple, who came first to the monument, entered also ; and he saw and believed [the report.] For as yet they did not understand from the Scriptures that he was to rise from the dead. Then the disciples returned to their companions.*

11 *But Mary stood without near the monument weeping. As she wept, stooping down to look into the monument, she saw two angels in white, sitting where the body of Jesus had lain, one at the head, the other at the feet. And they said to her, Woman, why weepest thou ? She answered, Because they have taken away my Master, and I know not where they have laid*
 Mar. 16 ; 9. 14 *him. Having said this, she turned about and saw Jesus standing, but knew not that it was*
 15 *Jesus. Jesus said to her, Woman, why weepest thou ? whom seekest thou ? She supposing him to be the gardener, answered, Sir, if thou have conveyed him hence, tell me where thou hast*
 16 *laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus said to her, Mary. She turning said to him, Rabboni,*
 17 *that is, Doctor. Jesus said to her, Lay not hands on me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father ; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, ‘ I ascend to my Father, and your*
 18 *‘ Father, my God and your God.’ Mary Magdalene went and informed the disciples that she had seen the Master, and that he had spoken these things to her.*

Mar. 16 ; 14.
Lu. 24 ; 36.

19 *In the evening of that day, the first of the week⁶⁵, Jesus came where the disciples were con-*

SECT. XII.

CH. 20.

vened (the doors having been shut for fear of the
 Jews,) and stood in the midst, and said to them,
 20 Peace be unto you. Having said this, he shew-
 ed them his hands and his side. The disciples,
 therefore, rejoiced when they saw it was their
 21 Master. Jesus said again to them, Peace be
 unto you. As the Father hath sent me, so
 22 send I you. After these words he breathed on
 them, and said unto them, Receive the Holy
 23 Ghost. Whose sins soever ye remit, are re- Mat. 18; 18.
 mitted to them; and whose sins soever ye re-
 tain, are retained.
 24 Now Thomas⁶⁶, that is Didymus⁶⁶, one of the
 twelve, was not with them when Jesus came.
 25 The other disciples, therefore, said to him, We
 have seen the Master. But he answered, Un-
 less I see in his hands the print of the nails, and
 put my finger to the print of the nails, and my
 26 hand to his side, I will not believe. Eight
 days after, the disciples being again in the
 house, and Thomas with them, Jesus came, the
 doors having been shut, and stood in the midst,
 27 and said, Peace be unto you. Then turning
 to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, he said,
 and look at my hands; reach also thy hand and
 feel my side, and be not incredulous, but be-
 28 lieve. And Thomas answered, and said unto
 29 him, My Lord and my God. Jesus replied, Be-
 cause thou seest me, Thomas, thou believest:
 happy they who, having never seen, shall never-
 theless believe.

⁶⁶ See ch. xi: 16:

ch. 21; 5.

30 *Many other miracles Jesus likewise performed in the presence of his disciples, which are not*
 31 *recorded in this book. But these are recorded that ye may believe, that Jesus is the Messiah the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life through his name.*

XXI. *AFTERWARDS* Jesus again appeared to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias, and in this
 2 manner he appeared. Simon Peter and Thomas⁶⁷, that is, Didymus⁶⁷, Nathanael of Cana in
 3 Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples of Jesus being together, Simon Peter said, I go a-fishing. They answered, We will go with thee. Immediately they went, and got aboard a bark, but that night caught nothing.
 4 In the morning Jesus stood on the shore; the disciples, however, knew not that it was Jesus.
 5 Jesus said to them, My lads, have ye any victuals? They answered, No. Cast the net, cried he, on the right side of the bark, and ye will find. They did so, but were not able to draw it,
 7 by reason of the multitude of fishes. Then that disciple whom Jesus loved, said to Peter, It is the Master. Simon Peter hearing that it was the Master, girt on his upper garment (which he had laid aside) and threw himself into the sea.
 8 But the other disciples came in the boat (for they were not farther from land than about two hundred cubits,) dragging the net with the fish-
 9 es. When they came ashore they saw a fire burning and fish laid thereon and bread. Jesus
 10

⁶⁷ See ch. xi. 16.

SECT. XII.

CH. 21.

said to them, Bring of the fishes which ye have
 11 *now taken. Simon Peter went back and drew*
the net to land, full of large fishes, a hundred
and fifty three; and the net was not rent, not-
 12 *withstanding the number. Jesus said to them,*
Come and dine. Meantime none of the disci-
 13 *ples ventured to ask him, Who art thou? know-*
ing that it was the Master. Jesus then drew
near, and taking bread and fish, distributed
 14 *among them. This is the third time that Jesus*
appeared to his disciples after his resurrection.
 15 *When they had dined, Jesus said to Simon*
Peter, Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou me more
than these? He answered, Yes, Lord, thou
knowest that I love thee. Jesus replied, Feed
 16 *my lambs. A second time he said, Simon son of*
Jonas, lovest thou me? He answered, Yes,
Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus re-
 17 *plied, Tend my sheep. A third time he said,*
Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter
grieved at his asking this question a third time,
answered, Lord, thou knowest all things, thou
 18 *knowest that I love thee. Jesus replied, Feed*
my sheep. Verily verily I say unto thee, ^{2 Pet. 1; 14.}
in thy youth thou girtest thyself, and wentest
whither thou wouldst; but in thine old age,
thou shalt stretch out thy hands; and another
will gird thee, and carry thee whither thou
 19 *wouldst not. This he spake, signifying by*
what death he should glorify God. After these
words he said to him, Follow me.

CH. 21.

SECT. XII.

ch. 13 ; 23.

20 *And Peter turning about saw the disciple whom Jesus loved following (the same who leaning on his breast at the supper, had asked who*
 21 *it was that would betray him.) Peter seeing him, said to Jesus, And what, Lord, shall be-*
 22 *come of this man? Jesus answered, If I will, that he wait my return, what is that to thee,*
 23 *follow thou me. Hence arose the rumour among the brethren, that that disciple should not die; nevertheless Jesus said not that he should not die, but "If I will, that he wait my*
 " *return, what is that to thee?"*

ch. 20 ; 30.

24 *It is this disciple who attesteth these things, and wrote this account; and we know that his*
 25 *testimony deserveth credit. There were many other things also performed by Jesus, which, were they to be severally related, I imagine the world itself could not contain the volumes that would be written. Amen.*

END OF VOLUME THIRD.



THE
FOUR GOSPELS,

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK.

WITH

PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS,

AND

NOTES CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

✓
=====
BY GEORGE CAMPBELL, D. D. F. R. S. EDINBURGH.
Principal of the Marischal College, Aberdeen.
=====

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

WITH THE AUTHOR'S LAST CORRECTIONS.

Μοῦνη Ουτεον τῆ Αληθεια.

=====
BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY T. BEDLINGTON, AND C. EWER.

.....
1824.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It is proper to observe that, in the following Notes, repetitions and unnecessary references are, as much as possible, avoided. When an useful illustration of any word or phrase is to be found in the Notes on one of the succeeding Gospels, the place is commonly referred to; not so, when it is in one of the preceding, because it may probably be remembered; and if it should not, the margin of the text will direct to the places proper to be consulted. But when the explanation of a term occurs in the Notes on a preceding Gospel, on a passage not marked in the margin as parallel, the place is mentioned in the Notes. In words which frequently recur, it has been judged convenient to adopt the following

ABBREVIATIONS.

Al.	Alexandrian manuscript	E. B.	English Bible—in
An.	} Anonymous Eng. translation in 1729.	E. T.	} English translation—the same
Ar.			
Ara.	Arabic	Eng.	English
Arm.	Armenian	Er.	Erasmus
Be.	Beza	Eth.	Ethiopic
Beau.	Beausobre and Lenfant	Euth.	Euthymius
Ben.	Bengelius	Fr.	French
Cal.	Calvin	G. E.	Geneva English
Cam.	Cambridge manuscript	G. F.	Geneva French
Cas.	Castalio	Ger.	German
Cha.	Chaldee	Go.	Gothic
Chr.	Chrysostom	Gr.	Greek
Com.	Complutensian edition	Gro.	Grotius
Cop.	Coptic	Ham.	Hammond
Dio.	Diodati	Heb.	Hebrew
Diss.	Dissertation	Hey.	Heylyn
Dod.	Doddridge	J.	John

ABBREVIATIONS.

Itc.	Italic	Sa.	Saci
Itn.	Italian	Sax.	Saxon
L.	Luke	Sc.	Scott
La.	Latin	Sep.	Septuagint
Lu.	Luther	Si.	Simon
L. Cl.	Le Clerc	Sy.	Syriac
M. G.	Modern Greek	The.	Theophylact
Mr.	Mark	Vat.	Vatican manuscript
MS.	Manuscript	Vul.	Vulgate
Mt.	Matthew	Wa.	Wakefield
N. T.	New Testament	Wes.	Wesley
O. T.	Old Testament	Wet.	Wetstein
P.	Part	Wh.	Whitby
P. R.	Port Royal translation	Wor.	Worsley
Per.	Persic	Wy.	Wynne
Pisc.	Piscator	Zu.	Zuric translation.
Rh.	Rhemish		

If there be a few more contractions not here specified, they are such only as are in pretty general use. In terms which occur seldomer, the words are given at length.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MATTHEW.

THE TITLE.

THE title, neither of this, nor of the other, histories of our Lord, is to be ascribed to the penmen. But it is manifest, that the titles were prefixed in the earliest times, by those who knew the persons by whom, and the occasions on which, these writings were composed. For the sense wherein the word Gospel is here used, see Prel. Diss. V. P. II. § 18.

² *Κατα Ματθαιον*, according to Matthew, of Matthew, or by Matthew. These are synonymous, as has been evinced from the best authorities. Cas. rendered it *authore Matthæo*, properly enough. Nor is this, as Be. imagines, in the least repugnant to the claim of the Evangelists to inspiration. Paul does not hesitate to call the doctrine with which he was inspired *his Gospel*. Nor does any man at present scruple to call the Epistles written by that Apostle, *Paul's Epistles*.

³ *Το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον*. I have preferred this to every other title, because it is not only the briefest and the simplest, but incomparably the oldest, and therefore the most respectable. All the ancient Gr. MSS. have it. The titles in the old La. version called Itc. were simply *Evangelium secundum Matthæum—secundum Marcum*, &c. and in the most ancient MSS. and even editions of the present Vulgate they are the same. From the writings of the Fathers, both Gr. and La. it appears that the title was retained every where in the same simplicity, as far down as the fifth century.

Afterwards, when, through a vitiated taste, useless epithets came much in vogue, some could not endure the nakedness of so simple a title. It then became *Sanctum Jesu Christi Evangelium secundum Matthæum*, &c. which is that used in the Vul. at present. The N. T. printed at Alcalá (called the Complutensian Polyglot) is the first Gr. edition wherein a deviation was made, in this respect, from the primitive simplicity. The title is there in conformity to the Vulgate, printed along with it, *Το κατά Ματθαίον ἄγιον εὐαγγέλιον*. This mode was adopted by some subsequent editors. Most of the translators into modern languages have gone farther, and prefixed the same epithet to the name of the writer. Thus Dio. in It. *Il santo evangelio*, &c. *secondo S. Matteo*. The translators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. and L. Cl. in Fr. *Le sainte evangile*, &c. *selon Saint Matthieu*. Our translators after Lu. have not given the epithet to the Gospel, but have added it to the writer. Yet they have not prefixed this term to the names even of the Apostles in the titles of their Epistles. In this I think they are singular. The learned Wet. in his excellent edition of the Gr. N. T. remarks, that though the term corresponding to *Gospel* occurs in that book upwards of seventy times, it is not once accompanied with the epithet *holy*.

CHAPTER I.

1. *The lineage*, E. T. *The book of the generation*. *Βιβλος γενεσεως*. This phrase, which corresponds to the Heb. ספר תולדות ספֿר *scpher tholdoth*, is supposed, by some, to be the title of the first seventeen verses only; by others, of the whole book. The former in effect translate it as I have done; the latter *The History*. That in the first of these senses, and also for an account of progeny, the Gr. phrase is used by Hellenist writers, is undeniable; it is not so clear that it is used in the second, for a narrative of a man's life. It is true we sometimes find it where it can mean neither genealogy nor list of descendants, as in that phrase in the Sep. *Βιβλος γενεσεως ουρανου και γης*, Gen. ii. 4. the meaning of which is, doubtless, *the origin and gradual production of the universe*, which has plainly some analogy, though a remote one, to an account of ancestry. The quotations that have been produced on the other side, from the Pentateuch, Judith, and the Epistle of James, do not appear decisive of the question. Of still less weight is the name *Scpher toledoth Jesu*,

given to paltry, modern, Jewish fictions, written in opposition to the Gospel ; though this also has been urged as an argument.

² *Christ, Χριστος*, without the article, is here to be understood, not as an appellative, as it is in almost all other places of the Gospel, but as a proper name. Into this use it came soon after our Lord's resurrection; but not before. Some distinction was necessary, as at that time the name *Jesus* was common among the Jews. Diss. V. P. IV. § 7.

³ *Son, υου* indefinitely, not *του υου* *the son* emphatically. The sense is rightly rendered by Cas. *prognati Davide*, a descendant of David. There is a modesty and simplicity in the manner in which the historian introduces his subject. He says no more than is necessary to make his readers distinguish the person of whom he speaks, leaving them to form their judgment of his mission and character, from a candid but unadorned narration of the facts.

2. *Judah, &c.* My reason for preferring the O. T. orthography of proper names you have Diss. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

6. *By her who had been wife of Uriah.* *Εκ της του Ουριου.* Literally *By her of Uriah.* It is not just to say that the feminine article thus used denotes *the wife.* The relation is in this phrase neither expressed, nor necessarily implied, but is left to be supplied from the reader's knowledge of the subject. We have no idiom in English entirely similar. That which comes nearest is when we give the names, but suppress the relation, on account of its notoriety. Thus, if it were said, that David had Solomon *by Uriah's Bathsheba*, every body would be sensible that the expression does not necessarily imply that Bathsheba was *the wife*, more than *the widow, the daughter, or even the sister of Uriah.* We have an instance in Mark xvi.1. *Μαρια η του Ιακωβου* where the void must be supplied by the word *μητηρ* *mother.* The like holds of the masculine. In Acts i.13, *Ιακωβου Αλφαιου*, must be supplied by *υιος*, *son*; and in Luke, vi. 16. *Ιουδαν Ιακωβου*, by *αδελφον*, *brother.* What therefore is really implied, in any particular case, can be learnt only from a previous acquaintance with the subject. Hence we discover that the ellipsis in this place cannot be supplied by the word *wife*; for when Uriah was dead, he could not be a husband. Those therefore who render *εκ της του Ουριου* *of Uriah's wife*, charge the historian with a blunder of which he is not guilty, and mislead careless readers into

the notion that Solomon was begotten in adultery. The common version exhibits the sense with sufficient exactness.

8. *Uzziah, τον Οζιαν*. So the Sep. renders this name in Gr. 2 Chr. xxvi. 3. Whereas *Ahaziah* is by them rendered *Οχοζιας*. Some names are omitted in the line, in whatever way it be rendered here; for though *Ahaziah* was indeed the son of *Joram*, *Uzziah* was the father of *Jotham*.

11. Some copies read, *Josiah begat Jehoiachin; Jehoiachin had Jeconiah, &c.* and this reading has been adopted into some editions. But there is no authority from ancient MSS. translations, or commentaries, for this reading, which seems to have sprung from some over-zealous transcriber, who, finding that there were only thirteen in either the second series or the third, has thought it necessary thus to supply the defect. For if *Jehoiachin* be reckoned in the second series, *Jeconiah* may be counted the first of the third, and then the whole will be complete. But as, in very early times, the Fathers found the same difficulty in this passage which we do at present, there is the greatest ground to suspect the correction above mentioned.

11, 12. *About the time of the migration into Babylon. After the migration into Babylon, επι της μετακειβιας Βαβυλωνος. Μετα την μετακειβιαν Βαβυλωνος.* In the La. versions, the word *μετακειβια* is differently translated. The Vul. Arias, and Leo de Juda, render it *transmigration*, Be. *transportatio*, Pisc. *deportatio*, Er. Cal. and Cas. *exilium*, Lu. in Ger. calls it **gefangniß**, Dio. in Itn. *cattivita*, Si. and L. Cl. in Fr. *transmigration*. G. F. P. R. Beau. and Sa. adopt a circumlocution, employing the verb *transporter*. The E. T. says, *about the time they were carried away to Babylon. After they were brought to Babylon.* In nearly the same way the words are rendered by Sc. Dod. renders them, *About the time of the Babylonish captivity. After the Babylonish captivity.* Wa. says, *the removal to Babylon.* It is evident, not only from the word employed by the sacred historian, but also from the context, that he points to the act of removing into Babylon, and not to the termination of the state wherein the people remained seventy years after their removal, as the event which concluded the second epoch, and began the third, mentioned in the 17th verse. Whereas the La. *exilium*, Ger. **gefangniß**, Itn. *cattivita*, and Eng. *cap-*

tivity, express the state of the people during all that period, and by consequence egregiously misrepresent the sense. They make the author say what is not true, that certain persons were begotten after, who were begotten during, the captivity. Further, it deserves to be remarked that, as this Apostle wrote, in the opinion of all antiquity, chiefly for the converts from Judaism, he carefully avoided giving any unnecessary offence to his countrymen. The terms *captivity*, *exile*, *transportation*, *subjection*, were offensive, and, with whatever truth they might be applied, the Jews could not easily bear the application. A remarkable instance of their delicacy in this respect, the effect of national pride, we have in J. viii. 33. where they boldly assert their uninterrupted freedom and independency, in contradiction both to their own historians, and to their own experience at that very time. This humour had led them to express some disagreeable events, which they could not altogether dissemble, by the softest names they could devise. Of this sort is *μετοιχεβια*, by which they expressed the most dreadful calamity that had ever befallen their nation. The word strictly signifies no more than passing from one place or state to another. It does not even convey to the mind whether the change was voluntary or forced. For this reason we must admit that Be. Pisc. Beau. Sa. and the E. T. have all departed, though not so far as Cas. Lu. Dio. and Dod. from the more indefinite, and therefore more delicate expression of the original, and even from that of the Vul. from which Sa.'s version is professedly made. For the words used by all these imply compulsion. Nor let it be imagined that, because *μετοιχεβια* occurs frequently in the Sep. where the word in the Heb. signifies *captivity*, it is therefore to be understood as equivalent. That version was made for the use of Grecian or Hellenist Jews, who lived in cities where Gr. was the vulgar tongue; and as the translation of the Scriptures into the language of the place, exposed their history to the natives, they were the more solicitous to soften, by a kind of euphemism, a circumstance so humiliating as their miserable enthrallment to the Babylonians. For this reason, that event is, especially in the historical part, rarely denominated *αιχμαλωβια* *captivitas*, and never *διακομιδη* *transportatio*, but by one or other of these gentler names, *μετοιχια*, *μετοιχεβια*, *αποικια*, and *αποικεβια*, *colonia*, *migratio*, *demigratio*, *incolatus*,

seu habitatio in terra aliena. On the whole, the Vul. Si. L. Cl. and Wa. have hit the import of the original more exactly than any of the other translators above mentioned. I did not think the term *migration* so proper in our language, that word being in a manner appropriated to the Oriental doctrine of the passage of the soul, after death, into another body. *Emigration* is at present, I imagine, more commonly used, when the removal is voluntary. The simple term *migration* seems fully to express the meaning of the original.

16. *Messiah, Χριστος*. For the import of the word, see Diss. V. P. IV. § 9.

18. *Jesus Christ*. The Vul. omits *Jesu*, and is followed only by the Per. and Sax. versions.

19. *Being a worthy man, δίκαιος ων*. Some would have the word *δίκαιος*, in this place, to signify *good-natured, humane, merciful*; because, to procure the infliction of the punishment denounced by the law, cannot be deemed *unjust*, without impeaching the law. Others think that it ought to be rendered, according to its usual signification, *just*; and imagine that it was the writer's intention to remark two qualities in Joseph's character; first, his strict *justice*, which would not permit him to live with an adulteress as his wife; secondly, his *humanity*, which led him to study privacy, in his method of dissolving the marriage. Herein, say they, there can be no injustice, because there are many things, both for compensation and punishment, which the law entitles, but does not oblige, a man to exact. Though this interpretation is specious, it is not satisfactory; for if the writer had intended to express two distinct qualities in Joseph's character, which drew him different ways, I think he would have expressed himself differently; as thus, *Though Joseph was a just man, yet being unwilling, &c.* whereas the manner in which he has connected the clauses, seems to make the latter explanatory of the former, rather than a contrast to it. It has indeed been said, that the participle *ων* sometimes admits being interpreted *though*. In proof of this, Mat. vii. 11. and Gal. ii. 3. have been quoted. But the construction is not similar in either passage. Here the *ων* is coupled with another participle by the conjunction *και*. In the places referred to, it is immediately followed by a verb in the indicative.

In such cases, to which the present has no resemblance, the words connected may give the force of an adversative to the participle. On the other hand, I have not seen sufficient evidence for rendering *δικαιος* humane or merciful: for though these virtues be sometimes comprehended under the term, they are not specially indicated by it. I have therefore chosen a middle way, as more unexceptionable than either. Every body knows that the word *δικαιος* admits two senses. The first is *just*, in the strictest acceptance, attentive to the rules of equity in our dealings, particularly what concerns our judicial proceedings. The second is *righteous* in the most extensive sense, including every essential part of a good character. In this sense it is equivalent, as Chr. remarks, to the epithet *εναρετος*, *virtuous*, *worthy*, *upright*. And in this not uncommon sense of the word, the last clause serves to exemplify the character, and not to contrast it.

² *To expose her, αυτην παραδειγματισαι.* E. T. *to make her a public example.* In order to express things forcibly, translators often, overlooking the modesty of the original, say more than the author intended. It has not, however, been sufficiently adverted to, in this instance, that by extending the import of the word *παραδειγματισαι*, they diminish the character of benignity ascribed, by the historian, to Joseph. It was not the writer's intention to say barely, that Joseph was unwilling to drag her as a criminal before the judges, and get the ignominious sentence of death, warranted by law, pronounced against her, which few perhaps would have done, more than he; but that he was desirous to consult privacy in the manner of dismissing her, that he might, as little as possible, wound her reputation. The word appears to me to denote no more than making the affair too flagrant, and so exposing her to shame. So the Syrian interpreter, and the Arabian, understood the term. I have therefore chosen here to follow the example of the Vul. Leo. and Cal. who render the words, *eam traducere*, rather than that of Cast. and Pisc. who render them, *in eam exemplum edere*, and *eam exemplum facere*, which have been followed by our translators. The expressions used by these naturally suggest to our minds a condemnation to suffer the rigour of the law. Yet the original word seems to relate solely to the disgrace resulting from the opinion of the public, and not to any other punishment, corporal or pecuniary. Infamy is, indeed, a common attendant on every sort of public punishment. Hence by

a synecdoche of a part for the whole, it has been sometimes employed to express a public and shameful execution. And this has doubtless occasioned the difficulty. But that it is frequently and most properly used, when no punishment is meant, but the publication of the crime, Raphelius, in his notes on the place, has, by his quotations from the most approved authors, put beyond a doubt. I shall bring one out of many. It is from Polybius, Legat. 88. where he says, *Ἡ δὲ συγκλητος χρωμενη τῷ καιρῷ, καὶ βουλομενη ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ τοὺς Ροδιους, ἀποκριθὲν ἐξεβαλεν ἡς ἦν τὰ σιτεχοντα ταυτα.* “The senate taking the opportunity, and willing to *expose* the Rhodians, published their answer, whereof these are the heads.” I shall only add, that Ch. one of the most eloquent of the Gr. fathers, understood this passage in the Gospel as meaning no more; accurately distinguishing between *παραδειγματιζειν* and *κολαζειν*, *exposing and punishing*. Thus he argues concerning Joseph’s conduct on this trying occasion: *Καιτοιγε οὐ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ μονον ἦν ὑπευθυνος ἢ τοιαυτη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ΚΟΛΑΖΕΣΘΑΙ αὐτην ὁ νομος ἐκελευεν. Ἀλλ’ ὁ Ἰωσοφ οὐ μονον το μειζον ἐκεινο, ἀλλὰ καὶ το ἐλαττον συτεχωρησε, τὴν αἰσχυνην· οὐ γὰρ μονον οὐ ΚΟΛΑΣΑΙ, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑΤΙΣΑΙ ἐβουλετο.* “Now “such a woman (as Mary was then thought to be) was not only exposed to *shame*, but also by law subjected to *punishment*. Whereas “Joseph not only remitted the greater evil, the *punishment*, but the “less also, the *ignominy*; for he determined not only not to *punish*, “but not even to *expose* her.” For the meaning of a term which occurs in so few places in Scripture, and those not unfavourable to the explanation given, a term with which no ancient controversy was connected, the authority of such a man as Chr. is justly held decisive. The verdict of Euth. is in effect the same. This also is the sense which the translator into M. G. gives the term, saying, *μη θελοντας να τὴν φανερωσῃ*, adding as an illustration on the margin, *να τὴν πομπεψῃ*, *to defame her*.

³ *To divorce her, ἀπολυθαι αὐτην.* In the N. T. the word *ἀπολυειν* is the ordinary term for *divorcing* a wife, and thereby dissolving the marriage. Nor did it make any difference in the Jewish commonwealth, that the parties were only betrothed to each other, and that the marriage was not completed by cohabitation. From the moment of their reciprocal engagement, all the laws in relation to

marriage were in force between them. He was her husband, and she his wife. Her infidelity to him was adultery, and appointed to be punished as such, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. In conformity to this is the style of our Evangelist. Joseph is called, v. 16. Mary's *husband*; she, v. 20. his *wife*; the dissolution of their contract is expressed by the same word that is uniformly used for the dissolution of marriage by the *divorce* of the wife. I have preferred here and in other places, the term *divorcing*, to that of *putting away*. The latter phrase is very ambiguous. Men are said to *put away* their wives, when they put them out of their houses, and will not live with them. Yet the marriage union still subsists; and neither party is at liberty to marry another. This is not what is meant by *απολυειν την γυναικα* in the Gospel. Now a divorce with them might be very private. It required not, as with us, a judicial process. The determination of the husband alone was sufficient. Deut. xxiv. 1, 2. The utmost, in point of form, required by the rabbies, (for the law does not require so much) was that the writing should be delivered to the wife, in presence of two subscribing witnesses. It was not even necessary that they should know the cause of the proceeding. They were called solely to attest the fact. Now as the instrument itself made no mention of the cause, and as the practice of divorcing, on the most trifling pretences, was become common, it hardly affected a woman's reputation, to say, that she had been divorced. I should in some places prefer the term *repudiate*, were it in more familiar use.

20. *A messenger*, *αγγελος*. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

22. *Verified*, *πληρωθη*. E. T. *fulfilled*. Though it should be admitted, that the word *πληρωθη* is here used in the strictest sense, to express the fulfilment of a prophecy, which pointed to this single event: it cannot be denied that the general import of the verb *πληρωω*, in the Gospel, is more properly expressed by the Eng. verb *verify*, than by *fulfil*. Those things are said *πληρωθηναυ*, which are no predictions of the future, but mere affirmations concerning the present, or the past. Thus, ch. ii. 15. a declaration from the Prophet Hosea, xi. 1. which God made in relation to the people of Israel, whom he had long before recalled from Egypt, is applied by the historian allusively to Jesus Christ, where all that is meant is, that, with equal truth, or rather with much greater energy of signification, God

might now say, *I have recalled my Son out of Egypt*. Indeed the import of the Greek phrase, as commonly used by the sacred writers, is no more, as L. Cl. has justly observed, than that such words of any of the Prophets may be applied with truth to such an event. For it is even used, where that which is said to be fulfilled is not a prophecy, but a command; and where the event spoken of is not the obedience of the command (though the term is sometimes used in this sense also), but an event similar to the thing required; and which, if I may so express myself, tallies with the words. Thus, in the directions given about the manner of preparing the paschal lamb, it is said, Exod. xii. 46. *None of his bones shall be broken*. This saying the Evangelist J. xix. 36. finds *verified* in what happened to our Lord, when the legs of the criminals, who were crucified with him, were broken, and his were spared. ‘But were not the recal of Israel from Egypt, and the ceremonies of the passover, typical of what happened to our Lord?’ I admit they were. But it is not the correspondence of the anti-type to the type, that we call properly *fulfilling*: this English word, if I mistake not, is, in strictness, applied only, either to an event to which a prophecy directly points, or to the performance of a promise. Whereas the Greek word is sometimes employed in Scripture to denote little more than a coincidence in sound. In this sense I think it is used, ch. ii. 23. We have an instance of its being employed by the Seventy, to denote *verifying*, or *confirming*, the testimony of one, by the testimony of another, 1 Kings. i. 14. The word *fulfilling*, in our language, has a much more limited signification: and to employ it for all those purposes, is to give a handle to cavillers, where the original gives none. It makes the sacred penmen appear to call those things predictions, which plainly were not, and which they never meant to denominate predictions. The most apposite word that I could find in English is *verify*; for, though it will not answer in every case, it answers in more cases than any other of our verbs. Thus, a prophecy is *verified* (for the word is strictly applicable here also), when it is accomplished; a promise, when it is performed; a testimony, when it is confirmed by additional testimony, or other satisfactory evidence; a maxim or proverb, when it is exemplified; a declaration of any kind may be said to be *verified* by any incident to which the words can be applied. I acknowledge that this word does not, in every case, correspond to *πληροω*. A law

is fulfilled, not verified; and if the import of the passage be to denote that additional strength is given to it, it is better to say *confirmed*, or *ratified*. In some places it means to *fill up*, in others to *perfect*, in others to *make known*. Thus much I thought it necessary to observe, in regard to my frequent use of a verb which is but rarely to be found in other Eng. translations.

² *ἵνα πληρωθῆ*, literally, *that it might be verified*. The conjunction, in all such cases, denotes no more, than that there was exact a conformity between the event and the passage quoted, as there could have been, if the former had been effected, merely for the accomplishment of the latter. God does not bring about an event, because some Prophet had foretold it: but the Prophet was inspired to foretel it, because God had previously decreed the event. If such particles as *ἵνα*, or *ὅπως*, were to be always rigorously interpreted, we should be led into the most absurd conclusions. For instance, we should deduce from J. xix. 24. that the Roman soldiers, Pagans, who knew nothing of holy writ, acted, in dividing our Lord's garments, and casting lots for his vesture, not from any desire of sharing the spoil, but purely with a view that the Scriptures relating to the Messiah might be fulfilled; for it is said that they resolved on this measure, *ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ ἢ λεγούσα*.—See note on ch. viii. 17.

³ *In all this—was verified. τουτο δε ὁλον γεγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ*. Chr. and some others have considered this and v. 23. as spoken by the angel to Joseph; I consider these verses as containing a remark of the evangelist. By messages from heaven, particular orders are communicated, and particular revelations given. But I do not find this method taken, for teaching us how to interpret former revelations: whereas such applications of scripture are common with the evangelists, and with none more than with Mt. The very phrase *τουτο δε ὁλον γεγονεν*, with which this is introduced, he repeatedly employs in other places. (ch. xxi. 4. xxvi. 56.) Add to all this, that the interpretation given of the name Immanuel, *God with us*, is more apposite, in the mouth of a man, than in that of an angel.

23. *The virgin, ἡ παρθενος*. I do not say that the article is always emphatical, though it is generally so; or that there is a particular emphasis on it, in this passage, as it stands in the Gospel.

But the words are in this place a quotation; and it is proper that the quotation should be exhibited, when warranted by the original, as it is in the book quoted. Both the Sep. and the Heb. in the passage of Isaiah referred to, introduce the name *virgin* with the article; and as in this they have been copied by the Evangelist, the article ought doubtless to be preserved in the translation.

25. *Her first-born son, τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον.* As there were certain prerogatives, which, by the Jewish constitution, belonged to primogeniture, those entitled to the prerogatives were invariably denominated *the first-born*, whether the parents had issue afterwards or not. Nothing, therefore, in relation to this point, can be inferred from the epithet here used. The turn which Mr. Wes. and others, have given the expression in their versions, *her son, the first-born*, though to appearance more literal, is neither so natural nor so just as the common translation. It is founded on the repetition of the article before the word *first born*. But is it possible that they should not have observed, that nothing is more common in Gr. when an adjective follows its substantive, especially if a pronoun or other word intervene, than to repeat the article before the adjective? This is indeed so common, that it is accounted an idiom of the tongue, insomuch that, where it is omitted, there appears rather an ellipsis in the expression. Sc. in his notes on this verse, has produced several parallel expressions from Scripture, which it would be ridiculous to translate in the same manner; and which therefore clearly evince that there is no emphasis in the idiom.

² In regard to the preceding clause, *Joseph knew her not, until εως ου*; all we can say, is, that it does not necessarily imply his knowledge of her afterwards. That the expression suggests the affirmative rather than the negative, can hardly be denied by any candid critic. The quotations, produced in support of the contrary opinion, are not entirely similar to the case in hand, as has been proved by Dr. Wh. in his commentary. And as there appears here no Hebraism, or peculiarity of idiom, to vindicate our giving a different turn to the clause, I cannot approve Beau.'s manner of rendering it, though not materially different in sense: *Mais il ne l'avoit point connu lors qu'elle mit au monde son fils premier né.* The P.

R. translation and Si.'s are to the same purpose. The only reason which a translator could have here for this slight deviation, was a reason which cannot be justified; to render the Evangelist's expression more favourable, or at least less unfavourable, to his own sentiments. But there is this good lesson to be learnt, even from the manner wherein some points have been passed over by the sacred writers; namely, that our curiosity in regard to them is impertinent; and that our controversies concerning them savour little of the knowledge, and less of the spirit, of the Gospel.

CHAPTER II.

1. *Eastern Magians, μαγοι απο ανατολων.* E. T. *wise men from the East*; rendering the word *μαγοι*, as though it were synonymous with *σοφοι*. This is not only an indefinite, but an improper version of the term. It is indefinite, because those called *μαγοι*, were a particular class, party, or profession among the Orientals, as much as Stoics, Peripatetics, and Epicureans, were among the Greeks. They originated in Persia, but afterwards spread into other countries, particularly into Assyria and Arabia, bordering upon Judea on the East. It is probable that the Magians here mentioned came from Arabia. Now to employ a term for specifying one sect, which may, with equal propriety, be applied to fifty, of totally different, or even contrary, opinions, is surely a vague manner of translating. It is also, in the present acceptation of the word, improper. Formerly the term *wise men* denoted philosophers, or men of science and erudition; it is hardly ever used so now, unless in burlesque. Dod. perhaps comes nearer, in using the term *sages*: as this term is sometimes appropriated, though seldom seriously in prose, to men of study and learning: but it is still too indefinite and general, since it might have been equally applied to Indian Bramins, Gr. philosophers and many others; whereas the term here employed is applicable to one sect only. This is, therefore, one of those cases wherein the translator, that he may do justice to his author, and not mislead his readers, is obliged to retain the original term. Diss. VIII. P. II. § 1. Sc. and others say *Magi*; I have preferred Prideaux's term *Magians*; both as having more the form

of an Eng. word, and as the singular *Magian*, for which there is occasion in another place, is much better adapted to our ears, especially when attended with an article, than *Magus*. The studies of the *Magians* seem to have lien principally in astronomy, natural philosophy, and theology. It is from them we derive the terms *magic* and *magician*, words which were doubtless used originally in a good, but are now always used in a bad, sense.

2. *We have seen his star in the east country*, εἶδομεν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστὲρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ. E. T. *we have seen his star in the East*. To see either star or meteor in the East, means in Eng. to see it in the east quarter of the heavens, or looking eastwards. But this is not the Apostle's meaning here. The meaning here manifestly is, that when the Magians themselves were in the East, they saw the star. So far were they from seeing the star in the East, according to the Eng. acceptation of the phrase, that they must have seen it in the West, as they were, by its guidance, brought out of the east country westwards to Jerusalem. Thus the plural of the same word, in the preceding verse, signifies the countries lying east from Judea, *μαγοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν*. Some render the phrase *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ*, at its rise. But, 1st, The words in that case ought to have been, *ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ αὐτοῦ*; 2dly, The term is never so applied in Scripture to any of the heavenly luminaries, except the sun; 3dly, It is very improbable that a luminous body, formed solely for giving the Magians to Bethlehem, would appear to perform the diurnal revolution of the heavens from East to West. The expression used in Lu.'s version, *im morgenlande*, coincides entirely with that here employed.

² *To do him homage*, προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. The homage of prostration, which is signified by this Gr. word, in sacred authors, as well as in profane, was, throughout all Asia, commonly paid to kings and other superiors, both by Jews and by Pagans. It was paid by Moses to his father-in-law, Exod. xviii. 7. called in the E. T. *obeisance*. The instances of this application are so numerous, both in the O. T. and in the N. as to render more quotations unnecessary. When God is the object, the word denotes adoration in the highest sense. In old Eng. the term *worship* was indifferently used of both. It is not commonly so now.

4. *The chief priests, τους αρχιερείς.* By the term *αρχιερείς*, *chief priests*, in the N. T. is commonly meant, not only those who were, or had been *high priests* (for this office was not then, as formerly, for life), but also the heads of the twenty-four courses, or sacerdotal families, into which the whole priesthood was divided.

² *Scribes of the people, γραμματεῖς του λαου;* the men of letters, interpreters of the law, and instructors of the people.

5. *Bethlehem of Judea, Βηθλεεμ της Ιουδαιας.* Vul. both here and v. 1. *Bethlehem Judæ*, this reading has no support from either MSS. or versions, and appears to be a conjectural emendation of Jerom, suggested by the Heb. of the Nazarenes.

6. *In the canton of Judah, γη Ιουδα.* E. T. *in the land of Juda.* The word *γη*, without the article joined to the name of a tribe, also without the article, denotes the *canton* or territory assigned to that tribe. In this sense, *γη Ζαβουλων*, and *γη Ναφθαλειμ*, occur in ch. iv. 15. As the land of Judah might be understood for the country of Judea, I thought it proper to distinguish in the version things sufficiently distinguished in the original.

² *Art not the least illustrious among the cities of Judah, ουδαμως ελαχιωτη ει εν τοις ηγεμοσιν Ιουδα.* E. T. *Art not the least among the princes of Judah.* The term *ηγεμων*, in this place, denotes, *illustrious, eminent.* The metaphor *prince*, applied to city, is rather harsh in modern languages. It is remarked, that this quotation agrees not exactly either with the Heb. text, or with the Gr. version. There appears even a contradiction in the first clause to both these, as in them there is no negative particle. The most approved way of reconciling them, is by supposing that the words in the Prophet are an interrogation, which, agreeably to the idiom of most languages, is equivalent to a negation. On this hypothesis we must read in the O. T. *Art thou the least?* And in written language, an interrogation is not always to be distinguished from a declaration; though in speaking it may, by the emphasis, be clearly distinguishable. But, whatever be in this, it ought to be observed, that the quotation is only reported by the Evangelist, as part of the answer returned to Herod, by the chief priests and the scribes.

7. *Procured from them exact informatiōn, ηκριβωσε παρ' αυτων.* E. T. *Inquired of them diuigently.* In conformity to

this is the greater part of modern translations. The Vul. renders it *diligenter didicit ab eis*, making very rightly the import of the verb *ακριβω* to lie chiefly, not in the diligence of the inquiry, but in the success of it. Agreeable to this are most of the ancient versions, particularly the Sy. and the Ara. Dod. and Sc. have preferred these, and rendered the words, *Got exact information from them*. That this is more conformable to the import of the word, is evident from v. 16. where Herod makes use of the information he had gotten, for directing his emissaries in the execution of the bloody purpose on which they were sent; *according to the time* (as our translators express it) *which he had diligently inquired of the wise men*. This is not perfectly intelligible. It could not be the questions put by Herod, but the answers returned by the Magians, which could be of use for directing them. But, though the versions of Sc. and Dod. are preferable to the common one, they do not hit entirely the meaning of the Gr. word. It signifies, indeed, to get exact information, but not accidentally, or anyhow; it is only in consequence of inquiry, or at least of means used on the part of the informed. Be. has not badly rendered the verb, *exquisivit*, searched out, denoting both the means employed, and the effect. The better to show that this was his idea, he has given his explanation in the margin, *Certo et explore cognovit*.

12. *Being warned in a dream*, *χορηματισθεντες κατ' οναρ*. E. T. *Being warned of God in a dream*. With this agree some ancient, and most modern translations, introducing the term *response*, *oracle*, *divinity*, or something equivalent. The Syr. has preserved the simplicity of the original, importing only, *it was signified to them in a dream*, and is followed by L. Cl. That the warning came from God, there can be no doubt: but as this is not expressed, but implied, in the original, it ought to be exhibited in the same manner in the version. What is said explicitly in the one, should be said explicitly in the other; what is conveyed only by implication in the one, should be conveyed only by implication in the other. Now that *χορηματιζειν* does not necessarily imply *from God*, more than the word *warning* does, is evident from the reference which, both in sacred authors and in classical, it often has to inferior agents. See Acts x. 22. where the name of God is indeed both unnecessarily and improperly introduced in the translation, xi.

26. Rom. vii. 3. Heb. xii. 25. For Pagan authorities, see Raphaelius.

16. *Deceived*, ἐνεπαιχθη. E. T. *mocked*. In the Jewish style, we find often that any treatment which appears disrespectful, comes under the general appellation of *mockery*. Thus, Potiphar's wife, in the false accusation she preferred against Joseph, of making an attempt upon her chastity, says that *he came in to mock her*, Gen. xxxix. 17. *Ἐμπαιξαι* is the word employed by the Seventy. Balaam accused his ass of *mocking him*, when she would not yield to his direction, Num. xxii. 29. And Dalilah said to Samson, Jud. xvi. 10. *Thou hast mocked (that is, deceived) me, and told me lies*. As one who deceived them, appeared to treat them contemptuously, they were naturally led to express the former by the latter. But as we cannot do justice to the original, by doing violence to the language which we write, I thought it better to give the sense of the author, than servilely to trace his idiom.

² *The male children*, τοὺς παῖδας. Thus also Dod. and others. E. T. *The children*. Sc. follows this version, but says in the notes, "Perhaps *male children*:" adding, "Not that the masculine article *τοὺς* excludes *female children*: for had our historian intended to include both sexes under one word, *παῖδας*, he would have prefixed the masculine article as now." But how does he know that? In support of his assertion he has not produced a single example. He has shown, indeed, what nobody doubts, that as *παις* is of the common gender, the addition of *αρσην* or *θηλυ* serves to distinguish the sex without the article. But it is also true, that the attendance of the article *ὁ* or *ἡ* answers the purpose, without the addition of *αρσην* or *θηλυ*. *Pueri* and *puellæ* are not more distinguished by the termination in Latin, than *οἱ παῖδες* and *αἱ παῖδες* are distinguished by the article in Greek. I do not deny, that there may be instances wherein the term *οἱ παῖδες*, like *οἱ υἱοί*, may mean children in general. The phrase, both in Hebrew and in Greek, is *the sons of Israel*, which our translators render, *the children of Israel*, as nobody doubts that the whole posterity is meant. We address an audience of men and women, by the title *brethren*; and under the denomination, *all men*, the whole species is included. But in such examples, the universality of the application is either previously known from common usage, or is manifest from the subject or occa-

sion. Where this cannot be said, the words ought to be strictly interpreted. Add to this, 1st, That the historian seems here purposely to have changed the term *παιδιον*, which is used for *child* no fewer than nine times in this chapter; as that word being neuter, and admitting only the neuter article, was not fit for marking the distinction of sexes; and to have adopted a term which he no where else employs for infants, though frequently for men-servants, and once for youths or boys: 2dly, That the reason of the thing points to the interpretation I have given. It made no more for Herod's purpose to destroy female children, than to massacre grown men and women; and, tyrant though he was, that he meant to go no farther than, in his way of judging, his own security rendered expedient, is evident from the instructions he gave to his emissaries, in regard to the age of the infants to be sacrificed to his jealousy, that they might not exceed such an age, or be under such another.

³ *From those entering the second year, down to the time, απο διετους και κατωτερω, κατα τον χρονον.* E. T. *From two years old and under, according to the time.* There can be no doubt, that in this direction Herod intended to specify both the age above which, and the age under which, infants were not to be involved in this massacre. But there is some scope for inquiry into the import of the description given. Were those of the second year included, or excluded by it? By the common translation they are included; by that given above, excluded. Plausible things may be advanced on each side. The reasons which have determined me, are as follows. The word *διετης* is one of those which, in scriptural criticism, we call *ἀπαξ λεγομενα*. It occurs in no other place of the N. T. nor in the Sep. It is explained by Hesychius and Phavorinus, that which lives a whole year, *δι όλου του ετους*. *Διετησιος* is also explained in our common lexicons, *per totum annum durans, anniversarius*: and the verb *διετιζω* is used by Aristotle for *living a whole year*. At the same time it must be owned, that the explanation *bimulus, biennis*, is also given to the word *διετης*. The term is therefore doubtless equivocal; but what weighs with me here principally is, the ordinary method used by the Jews in reckoning time; which is to count the imperfect days, months, or years, as though they were complete, speaking of a period begun, as if it were ended. Thus it is said, Gen. xvii. 12. *The child that is eight days old among you shall be circumcised*; and Lev. xii. 3. *On the eighth day he shall be cir-*

cumcised. Now it is evident, that in the way this precept was understood, it behoved them often to circumcise their children when they were not seven days old, and never to wait till they were eight. For the day of the birth, however little of it remained, was reckoned the first; and the day of the circumcision, however little of it was spent, was reckoned the eighth. But nothing can set this matter in a stronger light than what is recorded of our Lord's death and resurrection. We are told by himself, that he was to be three days and three nights in the bosom of the earth; that his enemies would kill him, and that after three days he would rise again. Yet certain it is, that our Lord was not two days, or forty-eight hours, (though still part of three days), under the power of death. He expired late on the sixth day of the week, and rose early on the first of the ensuing week. Both these considerations lead me to conclude, with Wh. and Dod. that Herod, by the instructions given to his messengers, meant to make the highest limit of their commission, those entering, not finishing the second year. The lowest we are not told, but only that it was regulated by the information he had received from the Magians; for this I take to be the import of the clause, *κατα τον χρονον*. He had probably concluded, that the star did not appear till the birth, though they might not see it on its first appearance, and that, therefore, he could be in no danger from children born long before, or at all after, it had been seen by them. Supposing then, it had appeared just half a year before he gave this cruel order, the import would be, that they should kill none above twelve months old, or under six.

18. *In Ramah, Ev Παμα.* Ramah was a city on the confines of Benjamin, not far from Bethlehem in Judah. As Rachel was the mother of Benjamin, she is here, by the Prophet Jeremiah, from whom the words are quoted, introduced as most nearly concerned. It is true, however, that in the Heb. the term rendered *in Ramah*, may be translated *on high*. And both Origen and Jerom were of opinion that it ought to be so translated. But the authors of the Sep. have thought otherwise; and it is more than probable that the Evangelist, or his translator, have judged it best to follow that version. The mention of Rachel as lamenting on this occasion, gives a probability to the common version of the Prophet's expression. Otherwise it would have been more natural to exhibit Leah the

mother of Judah, than Rachel the mother of Benjamin, as inconsolable on account of a massacre perpetrated in a city of Judah, and aimed against one of that tribe.

² *Lamentation and weeping, and bitter complaint, θρηνος και κλανθμος και οδυρμος πολυς. Vul. Ploratus et ululatus multus.* In three Gr. copies θρηνος και are wanting. All the three words are in the Sep. in the passage referred to, though there are but two corresponding words in the Heb. In most of the ancient versions there is the same omission as in the Vul.

22. *Hearing that Archelaus had succeeded his father Herod in the throne of Judea, he was afraid to return thither.* Archelaus was constituted by Augustus *ethnarch* (that is, ruler of the nation, but in title inferior to *king*) over Judea, Samaria, and Idumea. The Orientals, however, commonly gave to such, and indeed to all sovereigns, the appellation of *kings*. The emperor is repeatedly so named in Scripture. And here the word *εβασιλευσεν* is applied to Archelaus, who succeeded his father, not in title, but in authority, over the principal part, not the whole, of his dominions. But though Joseph was afraid to go into Judea, strictly so called, he still continued in the land of Israel; for under that name, *Galilee* and a considerable extent of country lying east of the Jordan, were included. Prel. Diss. I. P. I. § 7.

23. *That he should be called a Nazarene, οτι Ναζωραιος κληθησεται. E. T. He shall be called a Nazarene.* The words may be rendered either way. A direct quotation is often introduced with the conjunction *οτι*. On the other hand, that the verb is in the indicative is no objection, of any weight, against translating the passage obliquely. The Heb. has no subjunctive mood, and therefore the indicative in the N. T. is often used subjunctively, in conformity to the Oriental idiom. And, as there is no place, in the Prophets still extant, where we have this affirmation in so many words, I thought it better to give an oblique turn to the expression.

² *Nazarene.* To mark a difference between *Ναζωραιος*, the term used here, and *Ναζαρηνος*, the common word for an inhabitant of Nazareth, Sc. and Dod. say *Nazaræan*, Wa. says *Nazorean*. But as the term *Ναζωραιος* is, by this evangelist, (xxvi. 71) used manifestly in the same sense, and also by both Mr. and J. I can see no reason for this small variation. Some find a coincidence in the name with a Heb. word for a *Nazarite*; others for a word signify-

ing *branch*, a term by which the Messiah, in the judgment of Jews, as well as of Christians, is denominated, Isaiah xi. 1.

It is proper to observe that, in the Heb. exemplar of this Gospel which was used by the Ebionites, and called *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the two first chapters were wanting:—the book began in this manner, *It happened, in the days of Herod king of Judea, that John came baptizing, with the baptism of reformation, in the river Jordan. He was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, and son of Zacharias and Elizabeth.* But for this reading, and the rejection of the two chapters, there is not one concurrent testimony from MSS. versions, or ancient authors. It is true the Al. has not the two chapters; but this is no authority for rejecting them, as that copy is mutilated, and contains but a very small fragment of Mt.'s Gospel. No fewer than the twenty-four first chapters are wanting, and the copy begins with the verb *ερχεται*, *cometh*, in the middle of a sentence, ch. xxv. 6. By a like mutilation, though much less considerable, the first nineteen verses of the first chapter are wanting in the Cam. which also begins in the middle of a sentence with the verb *παραλαβειν*, *to take home*. And in the Go. version all is wanting before the middle of the fifteenth verse of ch. v. It begins likewise in the middle of a sentence with the words answering to *επι την λυχνιαν*. Now if we abstract from these, which prove nothing, but that the words they begin with were preceded by something now lost; there is a perfect harmony in the testimonies, both of MSS. and of versions, in favour of the two chapters. The old Itc. translation and the Syr. were probably made before the name *Ebionite*, was known in the church. Even so early a writer as Irenæus, in the fragment formerly quoted (Pref. § 7.), takes notice that Mt. began his history with the genealogy of Jesus. That the Nazarenes, (or Jewish christians, on whom, though disciples, the Mosaic ceremonies were, by themselves, thought binding) who also used a Heb. exemplar of this gospel, had the two chapters, is probable, as Epiphanius calls their copy very full, *πληρεστατον*, though, it must be owned, he immediately after expresses some doubt of their retaining their pedigree. Si. thinks it probable that they did retain it, as he learns from Epiphanius that Carpocras and Cerinthus, whose notions pretty much coincided with theirs, retained it, and even used it in arguing against their adversaries. I might add to the

testimony of versions, MSS. and ancient authors, the internal evidence we have of the vitiation of the Ebionite exemplar, the only copy that is charged with this defect, from the very nature of the additions and alterations it contains.

CHAPTER III.

1. *In those days.* As the thing last mentioned was the residence of Jesus with his parents at Nazareth, the words *those days* may be used with strict propriety of any time before he left that city. Now John was about six months older than Jesus; it may therefore be thought not improbable that he began his public ministry so much earlier, each in the 30th year of his age, agreeably to the practice of the Levites, Num. iv. 3. But it must be owned that this is no more than conjecture: for as to the age of the Baptist, when he commenced preacher, scripture has been silent.

² *The Baptist, ὁ Βαπτιστής.* A title from his office, not a proper name. It is equivalent to the title given him, Mr. vi. 14. ὁ Βαπτίζων, *the Baptizer.* It is therefore improperly rendered into modern languages without the article, as Dio. has done in Itn. calling him *Giovanni Battista*, and all the Fr. translators I know (except L. Cl.), who call him *Jean Baptiste.*

³ *Cried, κηρυσσών.* Diss. VI. P. V.

⁴ *Wilderness, ἐρημῶ.* Mr. i. 3. N.

2. *Reform, μετανοεῖτε.* Diss. VI. P. III.

² *Reign, βασιλεία.* Diss. V. P. I.

4. *Of camel's hair,* not of the fine hair of that animal, whereof an elegant kind of cloth is made, which is thence called *camlet* (in imitation of which, though made of wool, is the English *camlet*), but of the long and shaggy hair of camels, which is in the East manufactured into a coarse stuff, anciently worn by monks and anchorets. It is only when understood in this way that the words suit the description here given of John's manner of life.

² *Locusts, ἀκρίδες.* I see no ground to doubt that it was the animal so named that is meant here. *Locusts* and *grasshoppers* are among the things allowed by the law to be eaten, Lev. xi. 22. and are, at this day, eaten in Asia, by the poorer sort; I have never had satisfactory evidence that the word is susceptible of any other interpretation.

5. *The country along the Jordan, ἡ περιχωρος του Ιορδανου.* Mr. i. 28. N.

7. *From the impending vengeance, απο της μελλουσης οργης.* E. T. *From the wrath to come.* Μελλων often means not only *future*, but *near*. There is just such a difference between *εσται* and *μελλει εσεθαι*, in Gr. as there is between *it will be* and *it is about to be*, in Eng. This holds particularly in threats and warnings. *Εσται λιμος* is *erit fames*; *μελλει εσεθαι λιμος* is *imminet fames*. In Job iii. 8. a Heb. word signifying *ready, prepared*, is rendered by the Seventy *μελλων*. Besides, its connexion with the verb *φυγειν* in this verse ascertains the import of the word. We think of fleeing only when pursued. The flight itself naturally suggests to spectators that the enemy is at hand. In cases however wherein no more appears to be intended than the bare prediction of an event, or declaration of some purpose, we are to consider it as equivalent to an ordinary future, ch. xvii. 22. N. The words, *the wrath to come*, appear to limit the sense to what is strictly called *the future judgment*.

8. *The proper fruit of reformation, καρπους αξιους της μετανοιας.* E. T. *fruits meet for repentance.* Vul. *fructum dignum pœnitentiæ.* A very great number of MSS. read *καρπον αξιον*, amongst which are some of the oldest and most valued; likewise several ancient versions, as the Ara. the second Sy. Cop. Eth. and Sax. It appears too, that some of the earliest fathers read in the same manner. Of the moderns, Lu. Gro. Si. Ben. Mill, and Wet. have approved it. It is so read in the Com. and some other old editions. *Καρπους αξιους* is universally allowed to be the genuine reading in L. Some ignorant transcriber has probably thought proper to correct one Gospel by the other. Such freedoms have been too often used.

10. *Turned into fuel.* Ch. vi. 30. ² N.

11. *In water—in the Holy Spirit, εν υδατι—εν αγιω πνευματι.* E. T. *with water—with the Holy Ghost.* Vul. *in aqua—in Spiritu Sancto.* Thus also, the Sy. and other ancient versions. All the modern translations from the Gr. which I have seen, render the words as our common version does, except L. Cl. who says, *dans l'eau—dans le Saint Esprit.* I am sorry to observe that the Popish translators from the Vul. have shown greater veneration for the style of that version than the generality of Protestant translators have shown

for that of the original. For in this the La. is not more explicit than the Gr. Yet so inconsistent are the interpreters last mentioned, that none of them have scrupled to render *εν τω Ιορδανη*, in the sixth verse, in *Jordan*, though nothing can be plainer, than that if there be any incongruity in the expression *in water*, this *in Jordan* must be equally incongruous. But they have seen that the preposition *in* could not be avoided there, without adopting a circumlocution, and saying, *with the water of Jordan*, which would have made their deviation from the text too glaring. The word *βαπτειν*, both in sacred authors, and in classical, signifies, *to dip, to plunge, to immerse*, and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the La. fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dying cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning. Thus it is, *εν υδατι, εν τω Ιορδανη*. But I should not lay much stress on the preposition *εν*, which, answering to the Heb. ׀, may denote *with* as well as *in*, did not the whole phraseology, in regard to this ceremony, concur in evincing the same thing. Accordingly the baptised are said *αναβαινειν*, *to arise, emerge, or ascend*, v. 16. *απο του υδατος*, and Acts viii. 39. *εκ του υδατος*, *from or out of the water*. Let it be observed further, that the verbs *ραινω* and *ραντιζω*, used in scripture for *sprinkling*, are never construed in this manner. *I will sprinkle you with clean water*, says God, Ezek. xxxvi. 25. or as it runs in the E. T. literally from the Heb. *I will sprinkle clean water upon you*, is in the Sept. *Ραινω εθ' υμας καθαρον υδωρ*, and not as *βαπτιζω* is always construed. *Ραινω υμας εν καθαρω υδατι*. See also Exod. xxix. 21. Lev. vi. 27. xvi. 14. Had *βαπτιζω* been here employed in the sense of *ραινω* *I sprinkle* (which as far as I know, it never is, in any use, sacred or classical) the expression would doubtless have been *Εγω μεν βαπτιζω εφ' υμας υδωρ*, or *απο του υδατος*, agreeably to the examples referred to. When therefore the Gr. word *βαπτιζω* is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved so far as may conduce to suggest its original import. It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The true partizan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the spirit, by that of the of the party.

² *In the Holy Spirit and fire, εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι.* Hey. with *holy wind and fire.* This most uncommon, though not entirely new, version of that learned and ingenious, but sometimes fanciful, interpreter, is supported by the following arguments: 1st, The word *πνευμα*, which signifies both *spirit* and *wind*, has not here the article by which *the Holy Spirit* is commonly distinguished. 2dly, The following verse, which should be regarded as an illustration of this, mentions the cleansing of the wheat, which is by *the wind* separating the chaff, and the consuming of the chaff by *the fire*. 3dly, The three elements, water, air, and fire, were all considered by the Jews as purifiers, and, in respect of their purifying quality, were ranked in the order now named, water the lowest, and fire the highest. The mention of the other two gives a presumption that the third was not omitted. The following answers are submitted to the reader: 1st. The article, though often, for distinction's sake, prefixed to *αγιον πνευμα*, is, when either the scope of the place, or the other terms employed, serve the purpose of distinguishing, frequently omitted. Now this purpose is more effectually served by the epithet *αγιον*, *holy*, than it could have been by the article. In ch. i. 18. and 20. the miraculous conception is twice said to be *εξ πνευματος αγιου*, without the article. Yet Hey. himself has rendered it, in both places, *the Holy Spirit*. Further, I suspect that no clear example can be produced of this adjective joined to *πνευμα*, where the meaning of *πνευμα* is *wind*. At least I have never heard of any such. 2dly, The subsequent verse is certainly not to be understood as an illustration of this, but as farther information concerning Jesus. This verse represents the manner in which he will admit his disciples; the next, that in which he will judge them at the end of the world. 3dly, I can see no reason, on the Dr.'s hypothesis, why *air* or *wind* should alone of all the elements be dignified with the epithet *holy*. *Fire*, in that view, would have a preferable title, being considered as the most perfect refiner of them all. Yet in no part of the N. T. is mention made of either *holy water* or *holy fire*. Now as it is acknowledged that *πνευμα* commonly signifies *spirit*, and when joined with *αγιον* *the Divine Spirit*, the word, by all the laws of interpretation, considering the peculiarity of the attribute with which it is accompanied, must be so understood here. It is however but doing justice to that respectable author to observe that he does not differ from others, in

regard to the principal view of the passage, the effusion of the Holy Spirit; only he thinks that the literal import of the word *πνευμα* in this place is *wind*, and that *the spirit* is but suggested to us, by a figure.

³ *And fire, και πυρι.* These words are wanting in several MSS. but they are found in a greater number, as well as in the Sy. the Vul. and all the ancient versions.

12. *His winnowing shovel in his hand, ουτο πτυον εν τη χειρι αυτου.* E. T. *Whose fan is in his hand.* Vul. *Cujus ventilabrum in manu sua.* In the old Vul. or Itc. the word appears to have been *pala* properly a *winnowing shovel*, of which mention is made Isa. xxx. 24. This implement of husbandry is very ancient, simple, and properly manual. The *fan* (or *van*, as it is sometimes called,) is more complex, and being contrived for raising an artificial wind, by the help of sails, can hardly be considered as proper for being carried about in the hand.

15. *Thus ought we to ratify every institution, ουτω πρεπον εστιν ημιν πληρωσαι πασαν δικαιοσυνην.* E. T. *Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* In the opinion of Chrysostom, and other expositors, *δικαιοσυνη* signifies in this place *divine precept*. It is the word by which מִשְׁפָּט *mishpat*, in Heb. often denoting an *institution* or *ordinance* of religion, is sometimes rendered by the Seventy. I have chosen here to translate the verb *πληρωσαι* rather *ratify* than *fulfil*, because the conformity of Jesus, in this instance, was not the personal obedience of one who was comprehended in the precept, and needed with others the benefit of purification, but it was the sanction of his example given to John's baptism as a divine ordinance.

16. *No sooner arose out of the water than heaven was opened to him, ανεβη ευθυσ απο του υδατος, και ιδου ανεωχθησαν αυτω οι ουρανοι.* E. T. *Went up straightway out of the water, and lo the heavens were opened unto him.* That the adverb *ευθυσ*, though joined with the first verb, does properly belong to the second, was justly remarked by Grotius. Of this idiom, Mr. i. 29. and xi. 2, are also examples.

CHAPTER IV.

1. *By the devil, ὑπο του διαβολου.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

3. *A son of God, υἱος του Θεου.* E. T. *The Son of God.* It does not appear to be without design that the article is omitted both in this verse and in the sixth. The words ought therefore to be rendered indefinitely *a son*, not emphatically *the son*. In the parallel passage in L. iv. 3. there is the same omission. And though in the 9th verse of that chapter we find the article in the present common Gr. it is wanting in so many ancient MSS. and approved editions, that it is justly rejected by critics. Whether we are to impute Satan's expressing himself thus to his ignorance, as not knowing the dignity of the personage whom he accosted, or to his malignity, as being averse to suppose more than an equality with other good men (for he does not acknowledge even so much); certain it is, that the passage he quotes from the Psalms, admits a general application to all pious persons. The omission of the definite article in this place is the more remarkable, as in the preceding chapter in both Gospels, the appropriation of the term *υἱος* by means of the article, in the voice from heaven, is very strongly marked, *ὁ υἱος μου ὁ αγαπητος.* See N. on ch. xiv. 33. xxvii. 54.

² *Loaves, αρτοι.* E. T. *Bread.* *Αρτος*, used indefinitely, is rightly translated *bread*; but when joined with *εις*, or any other word limiting the signification in the singular number, ought to be rendered *loaf*; in the plural it ought almost always to be rendered *loaves*. Even if either were proper, *loaves* would be preferable in this place, as being more picturesque. Our translators have here followed the Sy. interpreter, who seems to have read *αρτος*.

4. *By every thing which God is pleased to appoint, επι παντι ρηματι εκπορευομενω δια στοματος Θεου.* E. T. *By every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.* The whole sentence is given as a quotation. *It is written.* The place quoted is Deut. viii. 3. where Moses, speaking to the Israelites, says, *He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord, doth man live.* It

is evident that the Jewish lawgiver is speaking here of the food of the body, or sustenance of the animal life; as it was this purpose solely which the manna served, and which could not, in our idiom, be denominated a *word*. The reader may observe that the term *word* in the passage of the O. T. quoted is, in our Bible, printed in Italics, to denote that there is no corresponding term in the original. It might therefore have been literally rendered from the Heb. *every thing*. In the Sep. from which the quotation in the Gospel is copied, the ellipsis is supplied by *ρημα*. But let it be observed, that in scripture both the Heb. דָּבָר *dabar*, and the Gr. *ρημα*, and sometimes *λογος*, mean indifferently *word* or *thing*. Take the following examples out of a much greater number. L. i. 37. *Ουκ αδυνατησει παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα*. *Nothing is impossible with God*.—ii. 15. *Let us now go to Bethlehem, and see this thing, το ρημα τουτο, which is come to pass*. The phrase *το εκπορευομενον* (or *εξελθον*) *εκ του στοματος*, is oftener than once to be met with, in the version of the Seventy, for a *declared purpose, resolution, or appointment*. See Num. xxxii. 24. 1 Sam. i. 23. But nothing can be more express to our purpose than Jer. xlv. 17. *Ποιησομεν παντα λογον ος εξελευσεται εκ του στοματος ημων*. E. T. *We will do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, παντα λογον*, in Heb. כָּל דְּבַר לִי, *col hadubar, every word*, that is, *we will do whatsoever we have purposed*. The version I have given is, therefore, entirely agreeable both to the sense of the passage quoted, and to the idiom of holy writ. I may add, that it is much better adapted to the context than the allegorical explanation which some give of the words, as relating purely to the spiritual life. The historian tells us that Jesus had fasted forty days, that he was hungry, and in a desert, where food was not to be had. The tempter, taking his opportunity, interposes, “If thou be the Messiah, convert these stones into loaves.” The question was simply, What, in this exigence, was to be done for sustaining life? Our Saviour answers very pertinently, by a quotation from the O. T. purporting, that when the sons of Israel were in the like perilous situation in a desert, without the ordinary means of subsistence, God supplied them with food, by which their lives were preserved, (for it is not pretended that the manna served as spiritual nourishment), to teach us that no strait, however pressing, ought to shake our confidence in him. Beau. and the anonymous Eng. translator in 1729, exhibit the same sense in their versions.

6. *Lest, μηποτε.* E. T. *Lest at any time.* From an excessive solicitude, not to say less than the original, words have been explained from etymology, rather than from use; in consequence of which practice, some versions are encumbered with expletives, which enfeeble, instead of strengthening, the expression. Of this kind is the phrase *at any time*, which, in this passage adds nothing to the sense. The compound *μηποτε*, in the use of the sacred penmen, rarely signifies more than the simple *μη*, *lest*. It is used by the Seventy in translating a Heb. term that imports no more. In the Psalm referred to, it is rendered simply *lest*. And to go no farther than this Gospel, our translators have not hesitated to render it so in the following passages, vii. 6. xiii. 29. xv. 32. xxv. 9. xxvii. 64. Why they have not done so in this and most other places, I can discover no good reason.

7. *Jesus again answered, It is written, εφη αυτω ο Ιησους παλιν γεγραπται.* E. T. *Jesus said unto him, it is written again.* The words in the original are susceptible of either interpretation, the difference depending entirely on the pointing. I place the comma after *παλιν*, they after *Ιησους*. This was the second answer which Jesus made, on this occasion, to the devil. It is not easy to say in what sense the words quoted can be said to have been written again. The punctuation is not of divine authority, any more than the division into chapters and verses.

8. *Thou shalt not put the Lord thy God to the proof, ουκ εξπειρασεις Κυριον τον Θεον σου.* E. T. *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.* What we commonly mean by the word *tempting*, does not suit the sense of the Gr. word *εξπειραζω* in this passage. The Eng. word means properly either *to solicit to evil*, or *to provoke*; whereas the import of the Gr. verb in this and several other places is *to assay*, *to try*, *to put to the proof*. It is thus the word is used, Gen. xxii. 1. where God is said to have *tempted* Abraham, commanding him to offer up his son Isaac for a burnt offering. God did not solicit the patriarch to evil, for, in this sense, as the Apostle James tells us, i. 13. he neither can be tempted, nor tempteth any man. But God *tried* Abraham, as the word ought manifestly to have been rendered, putting his faith and obedience to the proof. His ready compliance, so far from being evil, was an evidence of the sublimest virtue. It was in desiring to have a proof of God's care of them, and

presence with them that the children of Israel are said to have *tempted the Lord at Massa*, saying, *Is the Lord among us or not?* Ex. xvii. 7. And on the present occasion, it was God's love to him, and faithfulness in the performance of his promise, that the devil desired our Lord, by throwing himself headlong from a precipice, to *make trial of*. As, however, it has been objected that this last phrase, which I at first adopted, is somewhat ambiguous, I have changed it for one which cannot be mistaken.

15. *On the Jordan, πέραν του Ιορδανου.* E. T. *Beyond Jordan.* The Heb. word מעבר *megheber*, rendered by the Seventy *περαν*, signifies indifferently *on this side*, or *on the other side*. In Num. xxxii. 19. the word is used in both meanings in the same sentence. Unless therefore some other word or phrase is added, as *κατ' ανατολας*, or *κατα θαλασσαν*, to ascertain the sense, it ought to be rendered as in the text, or as in verse 25th. Zebulon and Naphtali were on the same side of the Jordan with Jerusalem and Judea, where Isaiah exercised his prophetic office.

² *Near the sea, ὁδον θαλασσης.* E. T. *By the way of the sea.* This expression is rather indefinite and obscure. There is an ellipsis in the original, but I have given the sense. What is here called *sea*, is properly, not *a sea*, but *a lake*. It was customary with the Hebrews to denominate a large extent of water, though fresh water, and encompassed with land, by the name *sea*. Both Mt. and Mr. denominate this *the sea of Galilee*; J. calls it *the sea of Tiberias*; L. more properly, *the lake of Gennesareth*. It was on this lake that Capernaum, and some other towns of note, were situated. Here also Peter and Andrew, James and John, before they were called to the apostleship, exercised the occupation of fishers. *The sea of Galilee*, and *the sea of Tiberias*, are become, in scripture-style, so much like proper names, that it might look affected to change them, for *the lake of Galilee*, and *the lake of Tiberias*. Besides, where it can conveniently be done, these small differences in phraseology, which diversify the styles of the Evangelists, in the original, ought to be preserved in the translation.

16. *A region of the shades of death, χωρα και σκια θανατου.* In the Sep. in the passage referred to, the words are *χωρα σκιας θανατου*; literally from the Heb. of the prophet, ארץ צל מות *arets tsal-moth*. *Tsal-moth*, it was observed, Diss. VI. P. II. § 2. and *sheol*,

are nearly synonymous, and answer to *ἀδης* in the N. T. which signifies the invisible world, or the state of the dead. The expression is here evidently metaphorical, and represents the ignorance or spiritual darkness in which the people of that region, who were intermixed with the heathen, lived, before they received the light of the Gospel.

17. *Began to proclaim*, *ἤρξατο κηρῦσσειν*, Mr. v. 17. N.

18. *A drag*, *αμφιβληστρον*. E. T. *A net*. The word is not the same here that is in the verse 20th; there it is *δικτυον*, which I take to be the name of the genus, and properly rendered *net*. The name here is that of a species answering to what we call *a drag*. The same historian, xiii. 47. uses the word *σαγγηνη*, which in the common translation is also rendered *net*. It is not very material, but neither ought it to be altogether overlooked, to make, when possible in a consistency with propriety, the phraseology of the version both as various, and as special, as that of the original. Diss. XII. P. I. § 9—13.

21. *In the bark*, *εν τω πλοιω*. E. T. *In a ship*. L. v. 2. N.

² *Mending*, *καταρτιζοντας*. Mr. i. 19. N.

CHAPTER V.

3. *Happy*, *μακαριοι*. E. T. *Blessed*. I agree with those translators who choose generally to render *μακαριος happy*, *ενλογητος* and *ενλογημενος blessed*. The common version rarely makes a distinction.

² *Happy the poor*, *μακαριοι οι πτωχοι*. E. T. *Blessed are the poor*. It has more energy in these aphoristical sentences, after the example of the original, and all the ancient versions, to omit the substantive verb. The idiom of our language admits this freedom as easily as the Itn. and more so than the Fr. None of the La. versions express the verb. Dio.'s Itn. does not; nor do the Fr. versions of P. R. L. Cl. and Sa.—Si. expresses it in the first beatitude, but not in the following ones. Another reason which induced me to adopt this manner is to render these aphorisms, in regard to happiness, as similar in form as they are in the original, to the aphorisms in regard to wretchedness, which are, L. vi. contrasted with them, *wo to you that are rich*—for I shall show, in the note on that pas-

sage, that the verb to be supplied is the indicative mood equally in both.

³ *Happy the poor who repine not, μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι.* E. T. *Blessed are the poor in spirit.* I have assigned my reason, Diss. XI. P. I. § 18. for thinking that it is as much the business of a translator to translate phrases as to translate words. An idiomatic phrase stands precisely on the same footing with a compound word. The meaning is commonly learnt from the usual application of the whole word, or of the whole phrase, and not by the detached meanings of the several parts, which, in another language, conjoined, in the same manner, may convey either no meaning at all, or a meaning very different from the author's. Such, in a particular manner, is the meaning which the phrase *poor in spirit*, naturally conveys to English ears. *Poor-spirited*, which to appearance is coincident with it, is always employed in a bad sense, and denotes mean, dastardly, servile. *Poorness of spirit* is the same ill quality in the abstract. The phrase, therefore, in our language, if it can be said to suggest any sense, suggests one different from the sense in the text. In support of the intepretation here given, let the following things be attended to: First, That it is literally *the poor* that is meant, may be fairly concluded from the parallel place, L. vi. 20. where the like declaration is pronounced of *the poor* simply, without any limitation, as in this passage. And this is of considerable weight, whether we consider the discourse recorded by L. as the same, or different, since their coincidence in many things, and similarity in others, are confessed on all sides. Now what puts it beyond a doubt, that it is *the poor* in the proper sense that is meant there, is the characters contrasted to those pronounced *happy*. These begin v. 24. *Woe unto you that are rich.* It is also not without its weight, that our Lord begins with *the poor* on both occasions; but especially that the same beatitude is ascribed to both: *Theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* I might urge further that, if *the poor* be not meant here, there is none of these maxims that relates to them. Now this omission is very improbable, in ushering in the laws of a dispensation which was entitled, many ages before, *glad tidings to the poor*; to announce which was one great end of the Messiah's mission. And the fulfilment of this prophecy in him, is what our Lord fails not to observe on more occasions than one. I cannot therefore agree with Wh. and others, in thinking that

πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι means *humble*. The quotations produced by that critic, in support of his opinion, are more foreign to his purpose than any thing I have yet discovered in his learned Commentaries. "The usual expression," says he, "by which the Scriptures [meaning the O. T.] and the Jewish writers represent the humble man is, that he is *shephal ruach*, i. e. poor, low, or contrite in his spirit." And of this he brings some examples. It is true, the meaning of *shephal* is humble, and of *ruach* is spirit. But because, in Scripture, men humble of spirit means humble men, must therefore *the poor in spirit* also mean humble men? To make the inconclusiveness of this reasoning pass unobserved, he has inserted the word *poor*, amongst others, in his explanation of the word *shephal*. But that it ever means *poor*, I have not found so much as a single example. It is never translated by the Seventy πτωχος; but either ταπεινος, or by some word of like import. As to the phrase *shephal ruach*, it occurs but thrice in Scripture. In one place it is rendered πραύθυμος, in another ταπεινοφρων, and in the third ολιγοψυχος. Should any object, that to exclude *the humble* from a place here, will seem as unsuitable to the temper of our religion, as to exclude *the poor*; I answer, that I understand *the humble* to be comprehended under the third beatitude: *Happy the meek*. Not that I look upon the two words as strictly synonymous, but as expressing the same disposition under different aspects; *humility*, in the contemplation of self as in the divine presence; *meekness*, as regarding the conduct towards other men. This temper is accordingly opposed to pride as well as to anger. The words seem to have been often used indiscriminately. *Humble* in the Heb. is once and again by the Seventy rendered *meek*, and conversely; and they are sometimes so quoted in the N. T. Nay, the very phrase for *lowly in spirit*, above criticised, *shephal ruach*, is at one time rendered πραύθυμος, *meek-spirited*, at another, ταπεινοφρων, *humble*. But should it be asked, what then does τῷ πνεύματι add to the sense of οἱ πτωχοὶ; I think the phrase to which Wh. recurs will furnish us with an answer. *Shephal* is properly ταπεινος, *humilis*; the addition of *ruach* is equivalent to τῷ πνεύματι. Such an addition therefore as is made to the sense of ταπεινος in the one phrase by τῷ πνεύματι, such also is made to the sense of πτωχος in the other by the same words superadded. It may be thought that no ad-

dition is made to the first, the simple term *ταπεινος* expressing a quality of the mind; but this is a mistake arising from the application of the Eng. word *humble*, which does not entirely coincide with the aforesaid terms in the ancient tongues. In all these the word properly refers to meanness of condition. In the few instances wherein *ταπεινος* signifies *humble*, and *ταπεινωσις* *humility*, there may be justly said to be an ellipsis, of *τη καρδια* or *τω πνευματι*. The proper word for *humble* is *ταπεινοφρων*, for *humility* *ταπεινοφροσυνη*. As therefore *ταπεινοφρων*, *ταπεινος τη καρδια*, and *ταπεινος τω πνευματι* (for this expression also occurs in the Sep. Pas. xxxiv. 18.), denote one whose mind is suited to the lowness of his station, so *πτωχος τω πνευματι* denotes one whose mind is suited to the pooriness of his circumstances. As the former imports unambitious, un aspiring after worldly honours or the applause of men; the latter imports unrepining, not covetous of earthly treasure, easily satisfied, content with little. This and humility are indeed kindred virtues, but not the same.

Wet. is singular in thinking that the words ought to be construed thus: *μακαριοι τω πνευματι—οι πτωχοι*. He understands *πνευμα* to mean the spirit of God, and renders it into La. *Beati spiritui pauperes*; as if we should say, *Happy in the Spirit's account are the poor*. He urges that *πτωχοι τω πνευματι* is unexampled. But is it more so than *μακαριοι τω πνευματι*? Or do we find any thing in Scripture analagous to this phrase in the manner he has explained it? I have shown that there is at least one phrase, *ταπεινος τω πνευματι*, perfectly similar to the other, which may well serve to explain it, and remove his other objection, that it ought to mean a bad quality. Besides, I would ask, whether we are to understand in verse 8th, *τη καρδια* as likewise construed with *μακαριοι*? for nothing can be more similar than the expressions *μακαριοι οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι* and *μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια*.

5. *They shall inherit, αυτοι κληρονομησουσι*. Vul. *Ipsi possidebunt*. The La. word *possidebunt* sufficiently corresponds to the Gr. *κληρονομησουσι*: which generally denotes possessing by any title, by lot, succession, purchase, conquest, or gift; I therefore think that Cas. judged better in following the Vul. than Be. who expresses the sentiment by a circumlocution which appears too positively to exclude possession of every other kind. *Ipsi terram*

hæreditario jure obtinebunt. But as the speciality which the word sometimes conveys may be more simply expressed in Eng. I have with the common version preferred *inherit* to possess. It happily accords to the style of the N. T. in regard both to the present privileges and to the future prospects of God's people. They are here denominated *sons of God*; and *if sons*, as the Apostle argues, *then heirs, heirs of God, and co-heirs with Christ.* The future recompense is called *a birth-right, an inheritance.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 17.

² *The land, τὴν γῆν.* E. T. *The earth.* That the word is susceptible of either sense cannot be doubted. The question is, which is the genuine sense in this passage? Let it be observed, that it had, long before then, become customary, amongst the most enlightened of the Jewish nation, to adopt the phraseology which the sacred writers had employed, in reference to ceremonial observances and temporal promises, and to affix to the words a more sublime meaning, as referring to moral qualities, and to eternal benefits. This might be illustrated, if necessary, from many passages of the N. T. as well as from the oldest Jewish writers. The expression under examination is an instance, being a quotation from Ps. xxxvii. 11. Now, in order to determine the sense of the word here, its meaning there should first be ascertained. Every person conversant in the Heb. knows that the word there used (and the same may be said of the Gr. and La. words by which it is rendered) sometimes means *the earth*, sometimes a particular *land* or country. Commonly the context, or some epithet, or the words in construction, remove the ambiguity. That, in the passage referred to, it signifies *the land*, namely Canaan, promised to the Patriarchs, is hardly called in question. As for *the earth*, it was given, says the Psalmist, to the children of men; even the idolatrous and profane were not excluded. Whereas this peculiar, this much favoured *land*, God reserved for the patrimony of Israel, whom he honoured with the title of *his son, his first-born.* To this, the ancient promises given to the Israelites had all a manifest reference. It is true, our translators have rendered the word, in the passage of the Psalms alluded to, *the earth*, merely, I imagine, that it might be conformable to what they understood to be the sense of the expression, in this place. A strong proof of this is that they have observed no uniformity, in their manner of translating

it, in this very Psalm. The word occurs six times. Thrice they translate it, *the land*, and thrice *the earth*. Yet there is not the shadow of a reason for this variation ; for no two things can be more similar than the expressions so differently rendered. Thus, v. 11. *The meek shall inherit the earth* ; v. 29. *The righteous shall inherit the land*. Indeed nothing can be plainer to one who reads this sacred ode with attention, than that it ought to be rendered *land*, throughout the whole. Peace, security, and plenty in *the land* which the Lord their God had given them, are the purport of all the promises it contains. ‘ But,’ it may be said, ‘ admit this were the meaning of the Psalmist, are we to imagine that the evangelical promise given by our Lord, is to be confined, in the same manner, to the possession of the earthly Canaan ?’ By no means. Nevertheless our Lord’s promise, as he manifestly intended, ought to be expressed, in the same terms. ‘ The new covenant which God hath made with us, by Jesus Christ, is founded on better promises than that which he made with the Israelites, by Moses. But then, the promises, as well as the other parts of the Mosaic covenant, are the figures or shadows, as the writer to the Hebrews well observes (ch. x. 1.), of the corresponding parts of the Christian covenant. Even the holy men under that dispensation were taught, by the Spirit, to use the same language, in regard to blessings infinitely superior to those to which the terms had been originally appropriated. David warns the people, in his time, of the danger of provoking God, to swear concerning them, as he had sworn concerning their fathers in the desert, that they should not enter into his rest. Yet the people were at that very time in possession of Canaan, the promised rest, and consequently could not be affected by the threat, in the ordinary acceptation of the words. Hence the aforecited author justly concludes (ch. iv. 9.), that the inspired penman must have had in his view another rest, which still remains for the people of God, and from which men’s disobedience may still prove the cause of their exclusion. Moses had his *land* of promise, with the prospect of which he roused the Israelites. Jesus Christ also has his, with the hope of which he encourages and stimulates his disciples. That it is the heavenly happiness that is meant, appears to me certain (for all the promises here relate to things spiritual and eternal,) but still conveyed under those typical expressions to which his hearers had been habituated. The Rh. in Eng.

and L. Cl. in Fr. are the only translators into modern languages with whose versions I am acquainted, who have expressed this properly. L. Cl. says, *ils posséderont le pays*. At the same time his note on the place shows that he misunderstood the sense. He supposed this declaration to relate solely to those Jews converted to Christianity, who, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the subversion of the Jewish polity, by the Romans, were allowed to live peaceably in the country, because they had taken no part in the war. These sentences with which our Lord's doctrine is introduced, are to be regarded not as particular predictions, but as universal axioms. All those who fall within the description, *the poor, the meek, the merciful*, in any age or country, are entitled to the promise. It is impossible that they should have been understood otherwise, at the time, by any hearer. The general tenor of the expressions used, unlimited by any circumstance of time or place, especially when compared with the scope and tendency of the whole discourse, shows manifestly that they are to be held as the fundamental principles of the new dispensation, to be introduced by the Messiah. Besides, all the other promises are confessedly such as suit the nature of the kingdom, which is declared by its founder and sovereign to be *not of this world*. How unreasonable is it then to think that this must be understood as an exception? Indeed some who render *την γην* *the earth*, acknowledge that heaven is meant. But how vague and arbitrary must this way of expounding appear, when we consider that *heaven* is in this very discourse contrasted to *earth*, and distinguished from it? That our Lord's style is often figurative is not to be denied. But the figures are not taken at random, nor to be interpreted by every body's fancy. They are adopted according to certain rules easily discoverable from an acquaintance with holy writ, and the Jewish laws and ceremonies. And of those rules, no one is more common than that which assigns a spiritual and sublime meaning, to expressions in the law, which relate merely to external rites, and temporal benefits. (See the N. on v. 8.) I shall only add, that all these promises are in effect the same, but presented under such different aspects as suit the different characters recommended. Thus *a kingdom* is promised to *the poor, consolation to the mourners, an inheritance to the meek*, who are liable here to be dispossessed of every thing, by the aspiring and the violent; and so of the rest.

4, 5. In the Vul. and the Cam. these verses are transposed. The Vul. is the only version, and the Cam. the only MS. where this arrangement is found.

6. *Who hunger and thirst for righteousness*, οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην. In the ordinary interpretation *to hunger and thirst* denotes to have an ardent desire. Maldonate was of opinion that the words ought rather to be rendered *who hunger and thirst because of righteousness*; that is, whose righteousness or integrity has occasioned their being reduced to such a state of indigence. His reasons for this exposition are as follows: 1st, That they who are in the literal sense hungry and thirsty are here meant, there is reason to presume from the parallel passage in L. where the words are, *Ye who hunger now*, without the addition of righteousness, or any word corresponding to it. 2dly, Though *thirst* is by the sacred authors often used metaphorically for the desire of spiritual good things, there is not any clear example that *hunger* is ever so applied. 3dly, Each of these declarations, commonly called beatitudes, regards a particular virtue, and not a virtuous character in general. I acknowledge that the first is the only one of these reasons which appears to me to have any weight. As to the second, a single instance of a metaphorical application, when plain from the context, is sufficient evidence. Besides, though *hunger* simply is not used by metaphor for the desire of spiritual things, the spiritual things themselves are represented by *bread* and by *meat*, as well as by *drink* (Is. lv. 1, 2. J. vi. 27.) ; and our participation in them is represented by *eating* as well as by *drinking* (J. vi. 50. 1 Cor. v. 2.) *Hunger* here therefore, coupled with *thirst*, may be accounted sufficiently explicit for expressing strong desire of spiritual things, in like manner as *eating* coupled with *drinking* denotes an ample participation in them. In tropes so closely related, the sense of one ascertains the sense of the other. As to the third reason, though righteousness is used to denote the whole of practical religion, *to hunger and thirst for righteousness* may, not improperly, be said to express one particular quality only, to wit, a zeal for higher attainments in virtue and piety. The declaration in v. 10th, may, in one view, be considered as equally general with this, and in another, as regarding solely the virtue of perseverance or con-

stancy. But what principally weighs with me is, first, the consideration that the common interpretation appears to have been the universal interpretation of the earliest ages. This is a strong presumption that it is the most natural, and best suited to the construction. 2dly, The omission of the preposition *δια*, on Maldonate's hypothesis, is not at all suited to the style of these writers; but that *διψω* is sometimes used actively, and governs the accusative of that which is the object of our thirst, we are authorized by Phavorinus to assert: *συντασσεται*, says that lexicographer, *αιτιατικη και γενικη, αιτιατικη μεν, ως το, εδιψησε σε η ψυχη μου, και διψω τους λογους*. The former of these examples is quoted from Ps. lxii. 2. answering to lxiii. 1. in the English Bible, which follows the Masoretic Heb. *My soul thirsteth for thee*. The passage appears in the same form in 'Trommius' Concordance, on the verb *διψω*. Yet in the common editions of the Sep. the pronoun is *σοι* not *σε*. But that the accusative is sometimes used as well as the dative and the genitive, is manifest from Wisd. xi. 14. *ουχ' ομοια δικαιους διψησαντες*. Besides, the sense which Maldonate gives, is included in v. 10. and this I think a strong objection to it.

8. *The clean in heart, οι καθαροι τη καρδια*. E. T. *The pure in heart*. I admit that this is a just expression of the sense, and more in the Eng. idiom than mine. My only reason for preferring a more literal version of the word *καθαρος* here is, because I would, in all such instances, preserve the allusion to be found in the moral maxims of the N. T. to the ancient ritual, from which the metaphors of the sacred writers, and their other tropes are frequently borrowed, and to which they owe much of their lustre and energy. The laws in regard to the cleanness of the body, and even of the garments, if neglected by any person, excluded him from the temple. He was incapacitated for being so much as a spectator of the solemn service at the altar. The Jews considered the empyreal heaven as the archetype of the temple of Jerusalem. In the latter, they enjoyed the symbols of God's presence, who spoke to them by his ministers; whereas, in the former, the blessed inhabitants have an immediate sense of the divine presence, and God speaks to them face to face. Our Lord, preserving the analogy between the two dispensations, intimates that *cleanness* will be as necessary in order to procure admission

into the celestial temple, as into the terrestrial. But at the privilege is inconceivably higher, the qualification is more important. The cleanness is not ceremonial, but moral; not of the outward man, but of the inward. The same idea is suggested, Ps. xxiv. When such allusions appear in the original, they ought, if possible, to have a place in the version.

9. *The peacemakers, οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί.* An. *the pacific; Hey. the peaceable.* Weakly both. With us these words imply merely a negative quality, and are equivalent to *not contentious, not quarrelsome, not litigious.* More is comprised here. This word is not found in any other part of Scripture, but (which is nearly the same) the verb *εἰρηνοποιεῖω* of the same origin occurs, Col. i. 20. where the connection shows that it cannot signify to be gentle, to be peaceable, but actively to reconcile, *to make peace.* Etymology and classical use also concur in affixing the sense of *reconciler, peacemaker,* to *εἰρηνοποιός.* It is likewise so explained by Chrysostom. Indeed, if no more were meant by it than those pacifically disposed, nothing additional, would be given here, to what is implied in the first and third of these characters; for as these exclude covetousness, ambition, anger, and pride, they remove all the sources of war, contention, and strife. Now, though all these characters given by our Lord are closely related, they are still distinct.

11. *Prosecute, διώξωσι.* E. T. *Persecute.* Some critics think, not improbably, that the word in this place relates to the prosecutions of the disciples (to whom Jesus here directly addresses himself) on account of their religion, before human tribunals whereof he often warned them on other occasions. In this verse, he descends to particulars, distinguishing *διώκειν* from *συνειδιξιεν*, and *εἰπεῖν παν πονηρον ρημα*, which seem also to be used in reference to judicial proceedings. In the preceding verse, and in the following, there can be no doubt that the verb is used in the utmost latitude, and ought to be rendered *persecute.* See also ch. x. 23. xxiii. 34.

15. *A lamp, λυχνον.* E. T. *A candle.* The meaning of the word is *lamp.* Candles were not used at that time in Judea for lighting their houses. *Λυχνία* consequently means a lamp-stand, not a candlestick.

² *Under a corn measure, ὅπο τον μωδιον. E. T. Under a bushel.* But they had no such measure. And though it is true that any measure of capacity will suit the observation, a translator ought not, even indirectly, to misrepresent the customs of the people. The measure mentioned by the Evangelist, so far from answering to our *bushel*, was less than our *peck*. But as nothing here depends on the capacity of the measure, it is better to adopt the general term, than to introduce uncouth names, without necessity. Diss. VIII. P. I. § 6.

³ As to the article prefixed to *μωδιον* and *λυγνιαν*, Sc. says, “Observe how the article loses its emphasis, and is rendered *a* instead of *the*.” I admit that the article may be in some cases redundant, but not that we have an example of its redundancy here. Is it not our constant way, when we name any utensil whereof there is but one of the kind in the house, to use the definite article? “Bring *me the* balance, that I may weigh this.” “Take *the* bushel, and mete the grain.” And even when there are more than one, if one be superior in value to the rest, or in more frequent use, it is commonly distinguished in the same manner. On the contrary, when there are more of a kind, and no one distinguished from the rest, we express ourselves indefinitely, as, “Give me *a* spoon:” “Set *a* chair for Mr. Such-a one.” Our Lord’s similitude is taken from the customs of families. He therefore uses the style which would be used in any house. This explains sufficiently why he says *a lamp*, as probably most houses had more than one, but *the modius*, there being but one, and *the stand*, as one might be in more frequent use than the rest, for the accommodation of the family. However, as the sense is sufficiently expressed either way, I have preferred the indefinite manner in my version, being better adapted to the more general terms I was obliged to adopt. See N. on ch. xxvii. 61.

17. *To subvert the law or the prophets, καταλυσαι τον νομον η τους προφητας. E. T. To destroy.* Of the different senses which have been assigned to the verb *καταλυσαι*, one is, when applied to a law, *to break* or *violate*. Though this is the sense of the simple verb *λυω*, v. 19. it cannot be the sense of the compound here. Nobody could suppose that it needed a divine mission to qualify one to transgress the law, which so many, merely from the

depravity of their own minds, flagrantly did every day. Another sense which suits better the context, is authoritatively *to repeal* or *abrogate*. This appears proper as applied to the law, but harsh as applied to the prophets, though by the prophets are meant, by a common metonymy, the prophetic writings. But even these we never speak of abolishing or abrogating. *To destroy* is rather saying too much, and is more in the military style than in the legislative. If every copy and scrap of these writings were obliterated or burnt, we could not say more than that they were destroyed. The context, in my opinion, shows that the import of the word here is not directly to rescind or repeal, but indirectly to supersede a standing rule by the substitution of another; which, though it does not, formally, *annul* the preceding, may be said, in effect *to subvert* it. This appears fully to express the sense, and is equally adapted to both terms, the law and the prophets.

² *But to ratify, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.* E. T. *But to fulfil.* The sense of the verb *πληρῶ* is ascertained by *καταλῶ*. We have seen that the meaning of this word cannot be *to break*, and therefore it is highly probable that the other means more than *to obey*. The proper opposite of weakening and subverting a law is *confirming* and *ratifying* it. See N. on ch. iii. 15. Some of great name translate it here *to complete*, perfect, or fill up, and think it alludes to the precepts, as it were, superadded in this discourse. I own there is a plausibility in this explanation; some of our Lord's precepts being, to appearance, improvements on the law. Yet I cannot help thinking, that these divine sayings are to be regarded rather as explanatory of the law, in showing its extent and spirituality, than as additions to it, not binding on men before, but deriving their power to oblige, purely from their promulgation by Jesus Christ. Besides, I find no example of the sense *to fill up* in any passage that can be reckoned analagous to the present. For the phrase *fill up the measure of your fathers* cannot surely be accounted of the number. The word *measure* there leaves no room to hesitate. It is otherwise here. The interpretation, *make fully known*, given by Benson (Essay concerning abolishing of the Ceremonial Law, ch. ii. sect. 2), though not implausible, does not make so exact a contrast to the preceding word *subvert*, nor is it, in this application, so well established by use.

18. *Verily I say unto you*, ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν. As Mt. has retained the Heb. word *amen*, in such affirmations, and is, in this, followed by the other Evangelists, though less frequently by L. than by the rest, it is not improper here, where the word first occurs, to inquire into its import. Its proper signification is *true, verus*, as spoken of things, *observant of truth, verax*, as spoken of persons, sometimes *truth* in the abstract. In the O. T. it is sometimes used adverbially, denoting a concurrence in any wish or prayer, and is rendered by the Seventy γεινοιτο, *so be it*. In this application the word has been adopted into most European languages. In the N. T. it is frequently used in affirmation. Now as L. has been more sparing than the other Evangelists, in the use of this Oriental term, it is worth while to observe, when he is relating the same passages of our Lord's history with them, what word he has substituted for the *amen*, as this will show in what manner he understood the Heb. adverb. The same prediction which in Mt. xvi. 8. is ushered in by the words ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν is thus introduced, L. ix. 27. λεγω ὑμιν ἀληθως, which answers to *truly* or *verily* with us. Another example of this interpretation we find, on comparing Mr. xii. 43. with L. xxi. 3. The only other example, in passages entirely parallel, is Mt. xxiii. 36. and L. xi. 51. where the ἀμην of the former is, by the latter, rendered by the affirmative adverb ναι. I have not observed any passage in the O. T. wherein the word *amen* is used in affirming; and therefore I consider this idiom in the Gospel as more properly a Syriasm than a Hebraism. Indeed some derivatives from *amen* often occur in affirmation. Such as *amenah*, Gen. xx. 12. Jos. vii. 20. rendered in the Sep. ἀληθως. Such also is *amenam*, which occurs oftener, and is rendered ἀληθως, ἐπ' ἀληθειας, ἐν ἀληθεια, or οντως, exactly corresponding to the application made of ἀμην in the Gospels. This is a strong evidence of the import of this word, in the N. T. as the nature of the thing will admit. Nor does there appear the shadow of a reason for the opinion maintained by some critics that, when used thus, it is of the nature of an oath. It is true that to swear by the God of truth, *elohe-amen*, is mentioned (Is. lxxv. 16.) as an oath; and so doubtless would it be to swear *by the God of knowledge*, or *by the God of power*. But does any body conclude hence, that the words *knowledge* and *power*, wheresoever found, or howsoever applied, include an oath? It has also been urged, that in the trial of

jealousy the woman is said to be charged with an oath of cursing (Num. v. 22.), when all that was required of her was so say, *amen*, *amen*, to the imprecation pronounced upon her by the priest in case she was guilty of the crime suspected. This was doubtless an imprecation and an oath, for *amen*, said in that manner, was equivalent to the repetition of the words spoken by the priest. Should the magistrate in an Eng. judicatory (where the oath administered to witnesses is still in the form of an imprecation) rehearse the words, concluding as usual, *so help you God*, and require of the witness only to say *amen*, it would be justly termed an oath, and an imprecation against himself, if he gave a false testimony. But does any man conclude hence that *amen* implies either oath or imprecation, when he subjoins it to prayers for health and safety? This character does not result from any single word, but from the scope and structure of the whole sentence.

Yet a critic of no less eminence than Father Si. after translating properly *αμην λεγω υμιν*, Mr. viii. 12. *je vous assure*, subjoins in a note, *autrement, je vous jure*. With how little reason this note is added, let the judicious reader determine. Our Lord often recurs to this solemn form of asseveration in this discourse upon the Mount, where he expressly forbids his disciples the use of oaths in their intercourse with one another. How would it have sounded from him to address them in this manner, ‘Swear not in any form; but let your answer to what is asked be simply yes or no; for I swear to you, that whatever exceedeth these proceedeth from evil?’ How would this suit the harmony which so eminently subsists between his precepts and example? In fact, his solemn manner was calculated to impress the hearers with a sense, not so much of the reality, as of the importance, of what was affirmed; the aim was more to rouse attention than enforce belief.

² *One iota, ιωτα εν.* E. T. *One jot.* I thought it better here, with most Itn. and Fr. translators, to retain the Gr. word than to employ a term which, if it have a meaning, hardly differs in meaning from the word *tittle* immediately following. This could be the less objected against, as our translators have oftener than once introduced the name of two other Gr. letters, *alpha* and *omega*, in the Apocalypse.

³ *Without attaining its end, εως αν γενηται.* L. ii. 2. N.

19. *Violate, λυση.* It is evident that the sense of the simple λυω is not here the same with that of the compound καταλυω in v. 17th. The verbs contrasted are different, καταλυω to πληρωω, λυω to ποιω. With regard to laws, the opposite to subverting is ratifying, to violating is practising. This is a further evidence that more is meant in v. 17th by πληρωω than barely obeying. And of the sense I have given it, we have here an actual example. For what tends more to ratify a law than additional sanctions, with which it was not formerly enforced ?

² *Or, και. E. T. And.* This is one of the cases wherein the copulative has the force of a disjunctive. The conjunction does but save the repetition of a common clause, which belongs severally to the words coupled. This remark will be better understood by resolving the sentence into the parts, whereof it is an abridged expression. Whoever shall violate these commandments, shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven ; and whoever shall teach others to violate them, shall be in no esteem, &c. Here the sense, with the aid of the copulative, is evidently the same with that expressed disjunctively in the version. One reason, beside the scope of the passage, for understanding the conjunction in this manner is because the verbs λυση and διδαξη are separated in the original, each having its regimen. Ὅς εαν ουν λυση μιαν των εντολων—και διδαξη οντω τους ανθρωπους. Consequently the και is not to be understood disjunctively in the end of the verse, where the verbs are more intimately connected, ὅς δ' αν ποιηση και διδαξη.

³ *Were it the least of these commandments, μιαν των εντολων τουτων ελαχιστων. E. T. One of these least commandments.* But if the commandments here mentioned were Christ's least commandments, what, it may be asked, were the greatest ? or, Why have we no examples of the greatest ? That this phrase is not to be understood, our translators themselves have shown by their way of rendering ch. xxv. 40. 45. The clause must therefore be explained as if arranged in this manner—μιαν των ελαχιστων των εντολων τουτων, the three last words being the regimen of the adjective, and not in concord with it.

⁴ *Shall be in no esteem in the reign of heaven—shall be highly esteemed, ελαχιστος κληθησεται εν τη βασιλεια των ουρανων—ουτος μεγας κληθησεται. E. T. He shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven—he shall be called great.* To be called great and to be called little, for to be esteemed and to

be disesteemed is so obvious a metonymy of the effect for the cause, that it naturally suggests itself to every discerning reader. By rendering therefore βασιλεια των ουρανων, agreeably to its meaning in most places, *the reign of heaven*, that is, the Gospel dispensation, there is not the smallest difficulty in the passage. But if this phrase be rendered *the kingdom of heaven*, as referring to the state of the blessed, and if *he shall be called the least in that kingdom* mean, as some explain it, *he shall never be admitted into it*, a most unnatural figure of speech is introduced, whereof I do not recollect to have seen an example in any author, sacred or profane.

20. *Excel, περισσευση.* E. T. *Exceed.* The original word expresses a superiority either in quantity or in kind. The latter difference suits the context at least as well as the former.

21. *That it was said to the ancients, οτι ερρεθη τοις αρχαιοις.* E. T. *That it was said by them of old time.* Be. *Dictum fuisse a veteribus.* Be. was the first interpreter of the N. T. who made the ancients those by whom, and not those to whom, the sentences here quoted were spoken. These other La. versions, the Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cas. Cal. and Pisc. are all against him. Among the Protestant translators into modern tongues, Be. whose work was much in vogue with the reformed, had his imitators. Dio. in Itn. rendered it *che fu detto dagli antichi*; the G. F. *qu'il a été dit par les anciens.* So also the common Eng. But all the Eng. versions of an older date, even that executed at Geneva, say *to them of old time.* Lu. in like manner, in his Ger. translation says, *zu den alten.* I have a Protestant translation in Itn. and Fr. published by Giovan Luigi Paschale in 1555, the year before the first edition of Be.'s (the place not mentioned,) which renders it in the same way with all preceding translators, without exception, *a gli antichi*, and *aux anciens.* All the late translators, Fr. and Eng. have returned to the uniform sense of antiquity, rendering it *to*, not *by*, the ancients. For the meaning of a word or phrase, which frequently occurs in scripture, the first recourse ought to be to the sacred writers, especially the writer of the book where the passage occurs. Now the verb *ρεω* (and the same may be observed of its synonymas) in the passive voice, where the speaker or speakers are mentioned, has uniformly the speaker in the genitive case, preceded by the preposition *υπο* or

δια. And in no book does this occur oftener than in Mt. See ch.ii. 15. 17. 23. iii.13. iv. 14. viii. 17. xii. 17. xiii. 35. xxi. 4. xxiv. 15. xxvii. 9. xxii. 31. In this last we have an example both of those to whom, and of him by whom, the thing was said, the former in the dative, the latter in the genitive with the preposition *ἔπο*. When the persons spoken to are mentioned, they are invariably in the dative. Rom. ix. 12. 26. Gal. iii. 16. Apoc. vi. 11. ix. 4. With such a number of examples on one side (yet these are not all), and not one from Scripture on the opposite, I should think it very assuming in a translator, without the least necessity, to reject the exposition given by all who had preceded him. It has been pleaded that something like an example has been found in the construction of one or two other verbs, neither synonymous nor related in meaning. Thus *προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις* ch. vi. 1. means to be seen by them. *Θεαομαι* in Gr. answers to *videor* in La. And the argument would be equally strong in regard to La. to say, because *visum est illis* signifies *it appeared to them*, that is, *it was seen by them*; *dictum est illis* must also signify *it was said by them*. The authority of Herodotus (who wrote in a style somewhat resembling, but in a dialect exceedingly unlike, that of the N. T.), in regard to a word in frequent use in Scripture, appears to me of no conceivable weight in the question. Nor can any thing account for such a palpable violence done the sacred text, by a man's of Be.'s knowledge, but that he had too much of the polemic spirit (the 'epidemic disease of his time) to be in all respects a faithful translator. Diss. X. P. V. § 5.

21. 22. *Shall be obnoxious to, ενοχος εσται*. E. T. *shall be in danger of*. To be *in danger of* evil of any kind, is one thing, to be *obnoxious to it*, is another. The most innocent person may be in danger of death, it is the guilty only who are obnoxious to it. The interpretation here given is the only one which suits both the import of the Gr. word, and the scope of the passage.

22. *Unjustly, εικη*. This word is wanting in two MSS. one of them the Vat. of great antiquity. There is no word answering to it in the Vul. nor in the Eth. Sax. and Ara. versions, at least in the copies of the Ara. transcribed in the Polyglots, which Si. observes to have been corrected on the Vul. and which are consequently of no authority as evidences. Jerom rejected it, imagining it to be an interpolation of some transcriber desirous

to soften the rigour of the sentiment, and, in this opinion, was followed by Augustine. On the other hand, it is in all the other Gr. MSS. now extant. A corresponding word was in the Itc. or La. Vul. before Jerom. The same can be said of these ancient versions, the Sy. Go. Cop. Per. and the unsuspected edition of the Ara published by Erpenius. Chrysostom read as we do, and comments on the word *εἰρη*. The earliest Fathers, both Gr. and La. read it. This consent of the most ancient ecclesiastic writers, the two oldest versions, the Itc. and the Sy. the almost universal testimony of the present Gr. MSS. taken together, give ground to suspect that the exclusion of that adverb rests ultimately on the authority of Jerom, who must have thought this limitation not of a piece with the strain of the discourse. I was of the same opinion, for some time, and strongly inclinable to reject it; but, on maturer reflection, judged this too vague a principle to warrant any alteration which common sense, and the scope of the place, did not render necessary. Mr. Wes. rejects this adverb, because, in his opinion, it brings our Lord's instructions on this head, down to the Pharisaic model; for the Scribes and Pharisees, he says, would have condemned causeless anger as well as Jesus Christ. No doubt they would. They would have also condemned the indulgence of libidinous thoughts and looks. [See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, &c. on v. 28.] But the difference consisted in this, the generality of the Scribes, at that time, considered such angry words, and impure looks, and thoughts, as being of little or no account, in themselves, and to be avoided solely, from motives of prudence. They might ensnare men into the perpetration of atrocious actions, the only evils which, by their doctrines, were transgressions of the law, and consequently, could expose them to the judgment of God. The great error which our Lord, in this chapter, so severely reprehends, is their disposition to consider the divine law, as extending merely to the criminal and overt acts expressly mentioned in it. From these acts, according to them, if a man abstained, he was, in the eye of the law, perfectly innocent, and nowise exposed to divine judgment. We are not, however, to suppose that this manner of treating the law of God was universal among them, though doubtless then very prevalent. The writings of Philo in that age, and some of their Rabbies since, sufficiently show that the Jews have always had some moralists among them, who, as well as some Christian casuists,

could refine on the precepts of their religion, by stretching them even to excess.

² *To the council, τῷ συνέδριῳ.* It might have been rendered *to the sanhedrim, συνέδριον* being the ordinary name given to that supreme judicatory. I accordingly call it so in those places of the history, where it is evident that no other could be meant. But as the term is general, and may be used of any senate or council, though very differently constituted from the Jewish, I thought it better here not to confine it. It is not improbable also, that there is an allusion in the word *κριθεῖ, judgment*, to the smaller or city-councils, consisting of twenty-three judges.

³ *Παπα* and *μωρε.* Preface to this Gospel, § 25.

⁴ *Γεενναν.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 1.

26. *Farthing.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

27. The words *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις* are not found in a great number of the most valuable MSS. and ancient versions, particularly the Sy. The Vul. indeed has them. Mill and Wetstein reject them.

28. *Another man's wife, γυναῖκα.* E. T. *A woman.* Er. *Uxorem alterius.* The word *γυνή* in Gr. like *femme* in Fr. signifies both *woman* and *wife.* The corresponding word in Heb. is liable to the same ambiguity. Commonly the distinction is made by some noun or pronoun, which appropriates the general name. But it is not in this way only that it is discovered to signify *wife.* Of the meaning here given and ascertained in the same way by the context, we have examples, Prov. vi. 32. Eccus. xxvi. 7. Wet. has produced more instances; but in a case so evident these may suffice. If we translate *γυναῖκα* woman, we ought to render *ἐμοιχενθεν αὐτήν* *hath debauched her.* The Gr. word admits this latitude. Thus Lucian (Dial. Dor. et Thet.) says of Acrisius, when his daughter Danae, whom he had devoted to perpetual virginity, proved with child, *ὑπο τινος μεμοιχενθαι οἰηθεις αὐτήν, ab aliquo stupratam fuisse illam arbitratus.* But I prefer the other way, as by changing here the interpretation of the word *μοιχειω*, the intended contrast between our Lord's doctrine and that of the Jews is in a great measure lost.

² *In order to cherish impure desire, πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμηθαι αὐτῆς.* E. T. *To lust after her.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. *Ad concupiscendum eam.* Pisc. *Ut eam concupiscat.* The Gr. preposition *πρὸς* before an infinitive with the article clearly marks the intention,

not the effect. This all the La. versions also do. The expression, ch. vi. 1. *προς το θεαθηναι αυτοις*, here rendered *in order to be observed by them*, is perfectly similar, and is manifestly employed to express the intention from which the Pharisees act. *Προς το* means, therefore, *in order to, to the end that*; whereas *ὥστε*, which we have ch. viii. 24. and L. v. 7. signifies *so as to, insomuch that*, and marks solely the effect. When an expression, with either of these prepositions, is rendered into Eng. simply by the infinitive, it may be doubted whether we are to understand it as expressing the intention or the effect, and whether we should supply before the sign of the infinitive the words *in order*, or *so as*. Hence it is evident, that the common version of this passage is not so explicit as the original.

29. *Insnare thee, σκανδαλιξει σε. E. T. Offend thee. Vul. Scandalizat te.* Nothing can be farther from expressing the sense of the Gr. term than the Eng. word *offend*, in any sense wherein it is used. Some render the expression *cause thee to offend*. This is much better, but does not give fully the sense, as it does not hint either what kind of offence is meant, or against whom committed. The translators from the Vul. have generally, after the example of that version, retained the original word. Sa. says, *Vous scandalize*; Si. no better, *Vous est un sujet de scandale*; the Rh. *Scandalize thee*. This I consider as no translation, because the words taken together convey no conceivable meaning. The common version is rather a mistranslation, because the meaning it conveys is not the sense of the original. The word *σκανδαλον* literally denotes any thing which causes our stumbling or falling, or is an obstacle in our way. It is used, by metaphor, for whatever proves the occasion of the commission of sin. The word *παγίς*, snare, is another term, which is, in Scripture, also used metaphorically, to denote the same thing. Nay, so perfectly synonymous are these words in their figurative acceptation, that, in the Sep. the Heb. word, *מקשׁוֹ* *makesh*, answering to *παγίς*, *laqueous, a snare*, is oftener translated by the Gr. word *σκανδαλον* than by *παγίς*, or any other term whatever. Thus Josh. xxiii. 13. What is rendered in Eng. literally from the Heb. *They shall be snares and traps unto you*, is in the Septuagint, *εβονται υμιν εις παγιδας και εις σκανδαλα.* Jud. ii. 3. *Their Gods shall be a snare unto you* *Οι θεοι αυτων, εβονται υμιν εις σκαν-*

δαλον. viii. 27. *which thing became a snare unto Gideon*, εγενετο τω Γεδεων εις σκανδαλον. 1K. xviii. 21. *that she may be a snare to him*, και εσται αυτω εις σκανδαλον. Ps. Gr. cv. cvi. 36. *which were a snare unto them*, και εγεννηθη αυτοις εις σκανδαλον. The word σκωλον, which is equivalent, is also used by the Seventy, in translating the same Heb. word. From the above examples, which are not all that occur, it is manifest that, in the idiom of the synagogue, one common meaning of the word σκανδαλον is *snare*; and that, therefore, to render it so in scripture, where it suits the sense, is to translate, both according to the spirit of the writer, and according to the letter. The anonymous version uses the same word.

32. *Except for whoredom*, παρεκτος λογου πορνειας. E. T. *saving for the cause of fornication*. The term *fornication* is here improper. The Gr. word is not, as the Eng. confined to the commerce of a man and a woman who are both unmarried. It is justly defined by Parkhurst, "Any commerce of the sexes out of lawful marriage." To this meaning of the word πορνεια etymology points, as well as scriptural use. It is the translation of the Heb. word פורנות and פנות which are employed with equal latitude as one may soon be convinced, on consulting Trommius' Concordance. The word, indeed, when used figuratively, denotes *idolatry*, but the context manifestly shows that it is the proper, not the figurative sense that is here to be regarded. Though πορνεια may not be common in classical Gr. its meaning is so well ascertained by its frequent recurrence both in the Septuagint and in the N. T. that in my opinion, it is as little to be denominated *ambiguous*, as any word in the language.

37. *But let your yes be yes, your no no*; εστω δε ο λογος υμων ναι, ναι, ου ου. E. T. *But let your communication be yea yea, nay nay*. I take this and the three preceding verses to be quoted James v. 12. I suppose from memory, as conveying the sense, though with some difference of expression, μη ομνετε μητε τον ουρανον, μητε την γην, μητε αλλον τινα ορκον ητω δε υμων το ναι, ναι, και το ου, ου. It is but just that we avail ourselves of this passage of the disciple, to assist us in explaining the words of his Master. It was a proverbial manner among the Jews (see Wet.) of characterizing a man of strict probity and good faith, by saying *his yes is yes, and his no is no*; that is, you may depend

his word, as he declares, so it is, and as he promises, so he will do. Our Lord is, therefore, to be considered here, not as prescribing the precise terms wherein we are to affirm or deny, in which case it would have suited better the simplicity of his style, to say barely *και και ου*, without doubling the words; but as enjoining such an habitual and inflexible regard to truth, as would render swearing unnecessary. That this manner of converting these adverbs into nouns, is in the idiom of the sacred penmen, we have another instance, 2 Cor. i. 20. For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him amen: *εν αυτω το ναι, και εν αυτω το αμην* that is, certain and infallible truths. It is indeed a common idiom of the Gr. tongue, to turn, by means of the article, any of the parts of speech into a noun. And, though there is no article in the passage under review, it deserves to be remarked that Chr. in his commentaries, writes it with the article, *το ναι, ναι και το ου, ου* as in the passage of James above quoted. Either he must have read thus in the copies then extant, or he must have thought the expression elliptical, and in this way supplied the ellipsis. Whichsoever of these be true, it shows that he understood the words in the manner above explained. Indeed they appear to have been always so understood by the Gr. Fathers. Justin Martyr, in the second century, quotes the precept in the same manner, in his second apology, *εστω δε υμων το ναι και το ου, ου*. And to shew that he had the same meaning, he introduces it with signifying, that Christ gave this injunction to the end that we might never swear, but always speak truth, *μη ομνειν ολωσ, τ' αληθη δε λεγειν αι*. Now, in the way it is commonly interpreted, it has no relation to the speaking of truth; whereas the above explanation gives a more emphatical import to the sentence. Thus understood, it enjoins the rigid observance of truth as the sure method of superseding oaths, which are never used, in our mutual communications, without betraying a consciousness of some latent evil, a defect in veracity as well as in piety. In like manner Clemens Alexandrinus, in the beginning of the third century, *Stromata*, lib. v. quotes these words as our Lord's: *υμων το ναι και το ου, ου*. The same also is done by Epiphanius in the fourth century lib. 1. *contra Ossenos*. Philo's sentiment on this subject (in his book *Περι των δεκα λογικων*) is both excellent in itself, and here very apposite. It is to this effect, that we ought never to swear, but to be so uniformly observant of truth in our conversation, that our word may always be regarded as an oath. *Καλλιστον, και βιωφετατον, και αομοττον λογικη φυσει, το ανωμοτον, ουτως αληθε-*

νειν εφ' ἑκάστου δεδιδαγμενη, ὡς τοὺς λόγους ὀρκους εἶναι νομιζεσθαι.

² *Proceedeth from evil, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.* Some render it *cometh from the evil one*, supposing τοῦ πονηροῦ to be the genitive of ὁ πονηρός, *the evil one*, that is, *the devil*. But it is at least as probably the genitive of το πονηρον *evil* in the abstract, or whatever this epithet may be justly applied to. The same doubt has been raised in regard to that petition, in the Lord's prayer, *Deliver us from evil, ἀπο τοῦ πονηροῦ*, or *from the evil one*. I consider it as a maxim in translating, that when a word is, in all respects, equally susceptible of two interpretations, one of which, as a genus, comprehends the other, always to prefer the more extensive. The *evil one* is comprehended under the general term *evil*. But in the phrase the *evil one*, the pravity of a man's own heart, or any kind of evil, Satan alone excepted, is not included. If we fail in the former way, the author's sense is still given, though less definitely. If we err in the other way, the author's sense is not given, but a different sense of our own. It has been affirmed that this adjective with the article ought always to be rendered *the evil one*; but it is affirmed without foundation. Το αγαθον denotes *good* in the abstract, and το πονηρον *evil*. L. vi. 45. See also Rom. xii. 9. Nor are these the only places.

39. *Resist not the injurious, μη ἀντιστηναι τῷ πονηρῷ.* E. T. *Resist not evil.* It is plain here from what follows that τῷ πονηρῷ is the dative of ὁ πονηρός, not of το πονηρον. It is equally plain that by ὁ πονηρός is not meant here *the devil*; for to that malignant spirit we do not find imputed in Scripture such injuries as smiting a man on the cheek, taking away his coat, or compelling him to attend him on a journey.

40. *Coat, χιτωνά—mantle, ἱματιον.* Diss. VIII. P. III. §. 1, 2.

42. *Him that would borrow from thee put not away, τὸν θελοντα ἀπο σοῦ δανεισθῆναι μη ἀποστραφῆς.* E. T. *From him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.* Of these two the former version is the closer, but there is little or no difference in the meaning. Either way rendered, the import is, *Do not reject his suit*

44. *Bless them who curse you.* This clause is wanting in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions, and in three MSS. of small account.

² *Arraign, ἐπηρεάζοντων.* E. T. *Despitefully use.* Vul. *Calumniantibus.* This suits better the sense of the word 1 Pet. iii. 16. the only other place in Scripture (the parallel passage in L. excepted) where it occurs, ὁ ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφήν, which our translators render, *who falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.* Elsner justly observes, that the word has frequently a forensic signification, for bringing a criminal charge against one. Its being followed by the verb διώκω makes it probable that it is used in that sense here. I have translated it *arraign*, because it suits the meaning of the word in the above quotation, and is equally adapted to the original in the juridical and in the common acceptance.

45. *That ye may be children of your Father in heaven ; that is, that ye may show yourselves by a conformity of disposition to be his children.*

² *Maketh his sun arise on bad and good, and sendeth rain on just and unjust, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατελλεῖ ἐπὶ πονηροῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.* E. T. *Maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* An indiscriminate distribution of favours to men of the most opposite characters is much better expressed, in the original, without the discriminative article, and without even repeating the preposition unnecessarily, than it is in our common version, where the distinction is marked by both with so much formality. Another example of this sort we have ch. xxii. 10. I am surprised that Sc. who, in general, more in the taste of the synagogue than of the church, is superstitiously literal, has, both here and elsewhere, paid so little regard to what concerns the article.

46. *The publicans, οἱ τελῶναι.* *The tollgatherers,* a class of people much hated, not only from motives of interest, but from their being considered as tools employed by strangers and idolaters for enslaving their country. Besides, as they farmed the taxes, their very business laid them under strong temptations to oppress. Johnson observes that *publican*, in low language, means *a man that keeps a house of general entertainment.* This is a manifest corruption. The word has never this meaning in the gospel : neither is this ever the meaning of the Latin etymon.

47. *Your friends.* E. T. *Your brethren.* the reading of most MSS. and some of the oldest is *τους φίλους ὑμῶν*. Of ancient versions also, the second Sy. and the Go. have read thus. It is the reading of the edition of Alcalá, and is favoured by Wet. and other critics. The sense, however, it must be owned, is little affected by the difference.

² *Wherein do ye excel?* *τι περιῶσον ποιεῖτε.* E. T. *What do ye more than others?* Our Lord had declared, v. 20. *Unless your righteousness excel, εἰν μὴ περιῶσεν ἡ, the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall never enter the kingdom of heaven.* Now to that declaration there appears, in the question *τι περιῶσον ποιεῖτε*, a manifest reference, which in the common version, disappears entirely. I have endeavoured to preserve it by imitating the original, in recurring to the term formerly used. Our Lord's expostulation is rendered more energetical by the contrast. 'If ye do good to your friends only, your righteousness, which, I told you, must excel that of the Scribes and Pharisees, will not excel even that of the Publicans and Pagans.'

³ *The Pagans.* The reading is *οἱ ἐθνηζοι* in the Cam. and several other MSS. It is supported by a number of ancient versions, the Vul. Cop. second Sy. Eth. Ara. Sax. It was so read by Chr. and several of the Fathers. It is, besides, much in our Lord's manner, not to recur to the same denomination of persons, but to others in similar circumstances. Publicans, when exhibited in the Gospel, as of an opprobrious character, are commonly classed with sinners, with harlots, or, as in this place, with heathens. The Go. has both words, but in a different order, Pagans in the 46th verse, and Publicans in the 47th.

CHAP. VI.

1. *That ye perform not your religious duties, τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν.* E. T. *That ye do not your alms.* Some MSS. have *δικαιοσύνην* instead of *ἐλεημοσύνην*. The Vul. has *justitiam vestram*. The Sy. and Sax. are to the same purpose. Some of the Fathers read so. I do not take *δικαιοσύνην* (which is probably the genuine reading) to be used here for *ἐλεημοσύνην*, and to mean *alms*, as mentioned in the next verse; but I conceive with Dod. this verse to be a common introduction to the three succeeding paragraphs, in

relation to alms, prayer, and fasting. This removes Wh.'s and Wet.'s principal objection to this reading, namely, that it is not likely the Evangelist would, in the following words, when naming alms, have thrice called them *ελεημοσυννη*, after introducing the mention of them by another name. As to Wet.'s objection to the hypothesis here adopted, that he does not find prayer and fasting ever called *δικαιοσυννη*, it is well answered by Bishop Pearce, that in our Lord's parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, propounded on purpose to rebuke the conceit which the Pharisees had of their own righteousness, mention is made of fasting and paying tithes, as coming under this denomination. Further, in ch. iii. 15. John's baptism, an ordinance in itself of a positive, not moral, nature, was comprehended under the same term. However, as the authorities for this departure from the common reading are not so numerous as those by which on most other occasions, I have been determined, it is proper to give the reasons which have inclined me to adopt this correction. It appears to be quite in our Lord's manner to introduce instructions regarding particular duties by some general sentiment or admonition, which is illustrated or exemplified in them all. In the preceding chapter, after the general warning, v. 20. *Unless your righteousness excel*, &c. there follows an illustration of the sentiment, in regard, 1st, to murder, next to adultery and divorce, 3dly, to swearing, and, 4thly, to retaliation and the love of our neighbour; the scope of every one of these being to enforce the doctrine with which he had prefaced those lessons. As, in the former chapter, he showed the extent of the divine law; in this, he shows that the virtue of the best performances may be annihilated by a vicious motive, such as vain glory. His general admonition on this head is illustrated in these particulars, alms, prayer, and fasting. Add to this, that if we retain the common reading, there is in v. 2. a tautology which is not in our Lord's manner. But if the first verse be understood as a general precept against ostentation in religion, the abstaining from the common methods of gratifying this humour, in the performance of a particular duty, is very suitably subjoined as a consequence.

2. *They have received their reward*, *απεχοσι τον μισθον αυτων*; that is, they have received that applause which they seek, and work for. Knatchbul and others think that the word *απεχω*

here means *hinder* or *prevent*. On this supposition the words may be rendered, *They preclude their reward*, to wit, the reward of virtue in heaven. But I do not find that in any other passage of the N. T. where the word occurs, this sense can properly be admitted. Wherever, in the Septuagint, the verb is used actively, the meaning is not to hinder, but to obtain. Were, therefore, the only classical authority that has been produced on the other side, as clear as it is doubtful, the ordinary version of the word, which is also that of the Vul. and Sy. and other ancient translations, is here, by all the rules of interpretation, entitled to the preference.

4. *Recompense thee*. In the common Gr. copies, after *αποδοσει σοι*, we read *εν τω φανερω*; which our translators render *openly*. But these words are not found in some ancient and valuable MSS. were not received by several of the most eminent Fathers, nor have been admitted into the Vul. the Sax. or the Cop. versions. Wet. thinks that both Jerom and Augustine have been led to reject this expression, by an excessive deference to the opinion of Origen, who did not think it probable that our Lord, in dissuading his disciples from paying a regard to the judgment of men, would have introduced, as an incitement, that the reward should be in public, a circumstance which brought them back, as it were by another road, to have still a regard to the esteem of men. But from the words which Wet. quotes from Augustine, that appears not to have been this Father's reason for rejecting those words. His declared reason was, because the expression was not found in the Gr. MSS. That by Gr. MSS. he meant Jerom's La. version, is presumed by Wet. without evidence, and against probability. The same appears to have been Origen's reason for rejecting the words; though he justly considered their containing something repugnant to the scope of the argument, as adding credibility to his verdict. And even this additional reason of Origen is, by the way, more feebly answered by Wet. than might have been expected: *Debat*, says he, speaking of Origen, *distinguere gloriam quæ a Deo est, et gloriam quæ est ab hominibus. Illi studendum est, non huic*. But did not Wet. advert, that in the promise, *God shall reward thee openly*, both are contained, honour from God the rewarder, and honour from men the spectators, the most incredulous of whom must be convinced, by so glorious an award of the infallible judge? Now, if the first ought

alone to be regarded, of what significance is it whether the reward, which God gives, shall be public or private? Er. and Ben. therefore, acted, not without reason, in rejecting these words. It appears to me most probable, that some transcriber, thinking it certain that the recompense here meant is that which will be given at the general judgment, and perceiving that *εν τω φανερω* made a good antithesis to *εν τω κρυπτω*, in the preceding clause, has added it by way of gloss on the margin, whence it has been brought into the text. This is probably the origin of some other interpolations. This remark should be extended to verses 6th and 18th. In regard to the last mentioned, the number of MSS. as well as of ancient versions which omit the *εν τω φανερω*, are so many, that Wet. himself has thought fit to reject it.

7. *Talk not idly μη βαττολογησθε.* E. T. *Use not vain repetitions.* This interpretation is rather too confined. *Vain repetitions* are doubtless included in the prohibition. But they are not all that is here prohibited. Every thing that may justly be called *words spoken at random, vain, idle or foolish*, may be considered as comprehended under the term *βαττολογειν*. The word *πολυλογία*, applied to the same fault in the latter part of the verse, is a further evidence of this.

10. *Thy reign come.* Diss. V. P. I.

11. *Our daily bread, τον αρτον ημων τον επιουσιον.* Vul. *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem.* Rhe. *Our supersubstantial bread.* The same word, *επιουσιον*, is however, in the parallel place in L. rendered in the Vulg. *quotidianum*. In this way it had been translated in both places in the Itc. with which agrees the Sax. version: *η επιουσα, viz. ημεξα*, means literally the *coming day*, a phrase which, in the morning, may have been used for the day already commenced, and in the evening, for *to-morrow*. There is probably an allusion here to the provision of manna made for the Israelites in the desert, which was from day to day. Every day's portion was gathered in the morning, except the seventh day's. But in order to prevent the breach of the Sabbath, they received a double portion on the sixth day. That food, therefore, may literally be termed *ο αρτος αυτων ο επιουσιος*. This suits, in sense, the Sy. *ρημη demahur*, the word, according to Jerom, used in the Nazarean Gospel, which is accounted, by critics of great name, a genuine though not

faultless copy of Mt.'s original. See the Preface, § 13. In the M. G. version it is *καθημερινον*.

12. *Our debts, τα οφειληματα ημων.* That *sins* are meant, or *offences against God*, there can be no doubt. At first, therefore, for perspicuity's sake, I rendered the verse thus: *Forgive us our offences, as we forgive them who offend us.* But reflecting that the metaphor is plain in itself, and rendered familiar by scriptural use; reflecting also, that the remission of real *debts*, in many cases, as well as *injuries*, is a duty clearly deducible from our Lord's instructions, and may be intentionally included in the cause subjoined to the petition, I thought it better to retain the general terms of the common version.

13. *Abandon us not to temptation, μη ειδενεγκης ημας εις πειρασμον.* E.T. *Lead us not into temptation.* The verb *εισφερειν*, in the Sept. is almost always used to express the Heb. verb *אגז* *to go*, in the conjugation *hiphil*, which, agreeably to the usual power of that conjugation, denotes, to cause to go, to bring, to lead. But though this be the usual, it is not the constant, import of that form of the verb. The *hiphil*, sometimes, instead of implying to cause to do, denotes no more than to permit, not to hinder. Nor need we be surprised at this, when we consider that, in all known languages, petitions and commands, things the most contrary in nature, are expressed by the same mood, the imperative. The words, *give me*, may either mark a request from my Maker, or an order to my servant. Yet so much, in most cases, do the attendant circumstances fix the sense, that little inconvenience arises from this latitude. In the N. T. there appear several examples of this extent of meaning in verbs, in analogy to the power of that conjugation. Mr. v. 12. *The devils besought him, saying, Send us, πεμψον ημας, into the swine.* Here the words, *send us*, mean no more than the words, *suffer us to go, επιτρεψον ημιν απελθειν*, do in Mt. In this sense the word is used also in other places, as when God is said, 2 Thess. ii. 11. *to send strong delusions.* *Send away*, Gen. xxiv. 54. 56. 59. means no more than *let go*.

* *Preserve us from evil, ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου.* E.T. *Deliver us from evil.* The import of the word *deliver*, in such an application as this, is no more than to rescue from an evil into which one has already fallen; but the verb *ρυσαι*, which is frequently

used by the Seventy for a Heb. word signifying *to save*, or *preserve*, denotes here as evidently, keep us from falling into evil, as, deliver us from the evils into which we are fallen. See cv. 37. 2.

³ Ὅτι σου ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. *Amην.* E.T. *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.* This doxology is wanting, not only in several ancient Gr. MSS. but in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Ara. versions. It was not in the Gr. copies used by Origen, Gregory Nysen, or Cyril. Cesarius quotes it, not as from the Scripture, but as from the liturgy used in the Gr. churches, whence, in all human probability, according to the judgment of the most celebrated critics, it has first been taken. I shall only add Wet.'s remark: "Si hæc
 " *δοξολογία* non pars est, sed appendix vel antiphona orationis dom-
 " *inicæ*, cui in ecclesia a sacerdote solo, et semper addi solebat, om-
 " *nia plana sunt, et facile intelligimus, cur librarii illam Mattheo ad-*
 " *jecerint; sin autem ab ipso Domino fuit præscripta, qui factum,*
 " *ut ipso verba præeunte, nec omnes discipuli, nec Lucas Evangelis-*
 " *ta, nec Patres Græci, nec tota ecclesia Latina sequerentur? Porro*
 " *si quis rem ipsam pro pius consideraverit, deprehendet, utique*
 " *δοξολογίαν* loco minus commodo hic inseri: apparet enim tum
 " *comma 14. hoc modo nimis longe removeri a præcedente com-*
 " *mate 12. cujus tamen explicandi gratia, adjectum est,*" &c.

18. *To thy Father; and thy Father to whom, though he is unseen himself, nothing is secret, τῷ πατρὶ σου, τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ.* E.T. *Unto thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret.* It must be acknowledged that the expression, *which is in secret*, is rather dark and indefinite. If understood as denoting that every the most secret thing is known to God, the latter clause, *which seeth in secret*, is a mere tautology: but this cannot be admitted to have been the intention of the sacred writer; for the manner in which the clause is introduced, shows evidently, that something further was intended by it than to repeat in other words what had been said immediately before. On v. 6. there is indeed a different reading, two MSS. want the article *τῷ* after *πατρὶ σου*, which makes the secrecy refer to the act of praying, not to the Father prayed to. In support of this reading, the Vul. and Ara. versions are also pleaded. But this authority is far too inconsiderable to warrant a change, not absolutely necessary, in point of meaning, or of construction. Besides, there

is no variation of reading on this 18th verse, either in versions or in MSS. Now the two passages are so perfectly parallel in their aim, and similar in their structure, that there is no ground to suppose a change in the one, which does not take place in the other. The unanimity, therefore, of the witnesses, that is, of the MSS. editions, and versions, which support the reading of v. 18th, is a strong confirmation of the common reading of v. 6th. But what then is to be understood by *ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ*? I answer, with Gro. Wh. and others, that *ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ* is here a periphrasis for *ὁ κρυπτομενος*, and signifies *hidden, unperceived, unseen*. The sentiment resembles that of the poet Philemon,

‘Ο πανθ’ ὄρων τε κ’αυτος ουχ’ ὄρωμενος ;

who sees all things, and is unseen himself; or of the more ancient poet Orpheus, as quoted by Clement of Alexandria (*Admonit. ad Gentes,*)

ουδε τις αυτου

Ειθορα θνητων αυτος δεγε παντας οραται.

To this purpose the words are rendered by Cas. *Patri tuo qui occultus est, et pater tuus qui occulta cernit*. Si. has understood this to be the meaning of the Vul. which says, *Qui est in abscondito*, as he translates it in this manner, *Votre pere qui ne paroît point ; et votre pere qui voit ce qu’il y a de plus cache*.

19. *Treasure, θησαυρους*. I have here retained the word *treasure*, though not perfectly corresponding to the Gr. *θησαυρος*. With us, nothing is *treasure* but the precious metals. Here it denotes *stores* of all kinds. That *garments* were specially intended, the mention of *moths* plainly shows. It was customary for the opulent in Asiatic countries, where their fashions in dress were not fluctuating like ours, to have repositories full of rich and splendid apparel. However, as the sense here could not be mistaken, I thought energy of expression was to be preferred to strict propriety. For the same reason I have retained the common version of *βρωσις rust* (though the word be unusual in this meaning,) because it may denote any thing which corrodes, consumes, or spoils goods of any kind. Dod. says *canker*.

22. *Sound* ἀπλους. E. T. *Single*. Both Chr. and The. represent the Greek word as synonymous here with ὑγιης, *sanus*.

23. *Distempered*, πονηρος. E. T. *evil*. The ἰσθωδης, *morbidus*. That there is no reference to the primitive meaning of ἀπλους, *simple*, or *single*, is evident from its being contrasted to πονηρος, and not to διπλους.

* *How great will the darkness be?* το σκοτος ποσον. E. T. *How great is that darkness?* The words are rendered in the same way in all the Eng. versions I have seen, except those made from the Vul. which says, *Ipsæ tenebræ quantæ erunt?* From this the other La. translations do not materially differ; nor the Itn. of Dio. *Quante saranno le tenebræ?* nor the Fr. of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. or L. Cl. who concur in rendering it, *Combien seront grandes les tenebres memes?* nor the Ger. of Lu. who says, *wie gross wird denn die finsterniß selber seyn?* The only foreign versions I have seen, which translate this passage in the same manner with the Eng. are the G. F. *Combien grandes seront icelles tenebres la?* and the Itn. and Fr. versions of Giovan Luigi Paschale. In the former of them it is, *Esse tenebre quanto sarranno grandi?* in the latter, *Combien grandes seront icelles tenebres?* Let it be observed, that there is nothing in the original answering to the pronoun *that*, which in this place mars the sense, instead of illustrating it. The concluding word *darkness*, it makes refer to *the eye*, whereas it certainly refers to *the body*, or all the other members as contradistinguished to the eye. Those who explain it of *the eye* represent our Saviour as saying, *If thine eye be dark, how dark is thine eye?* the meaning of which I have no conception of. In my apprehension, our Lord's argument stands thus: 'The eye is the lamp of the body; from it all the other members derive their light. Now if that which is the light of the body be darkened, how miserable will be the state of the body? how great will be the darkness of those members which have no light of their own, but depend entirely on the eye?' And to show that this applies equally in the figurative or moral, as in the literal sense: 'If the conscience, that mental light which God has given to man for regulating his moral conduct, be itself vitiated; what will be the state of the appetites and passions, which are naturally blind and precipitate?' Or, to take the thing in another view: 'You, my disciples, I have called the light of the world, because destined for instructors and guides

‘ to the rest of mankind ; but if ye should come, through ignorance
 ‘ and absurd prejudices, to mistake evil for good, and good for evil,
 ‘ how dark and wretched will be the condition of those who depend
 ‘ on the instructions they receive from you, for their guidance and
 ‘ direction ?’

24. *Mammon*, that is, *riches*. Mammon is a Sy. word, which the Evangelists have retained, as serving better to convey the energy of our Lord’s expression. Wealth is here personified, and represented as a master who rivals God in our hearts. The word is become familiar enough to our ears to answer the same purpose.

25. *Be not anxious*, μη μεριμνατε. E. T. *Take no thought*. I do not think there is, in the common version, a more palpable deviation than this from the sense of the original. Paul says, Eph. v. 18. μη μεθυσεσθε οινω, *Be not drunk with wine*. Should one translate this precept *Drink no wine*, the departure from the sense of the author would, in my opinion, be neither greater, nor more evident. Μεθη does not more clearly signify excess than μεριμνα does ; the former in indulging a sensual gratification, the other in cherishing an inordinate concern about the things of this life. Paul has suggested the boundaries, in his admonition to the Philippians, iv. 6. *Be careful for nothing*, μηδεν μεριμνατε, *but in every thing by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God*.

Even here the phrase would have been better rendered, *Be anxious about nothing* ; for doubtless we ought not to be careless about whatever is worthy to be the subject of a request to God. To *take no thought* about what concerns our own support, and the support of those who depend upon us, would inevitably prove the source of that improvidence and inaction, which are in the N. T. branded as criminal in a very high degree. See 1 Tim. v. 8. 2 Thess. iii. 8. There is not an apparent only, but a real, contradiction in the Apostle’s sentiments to our Lord’s precepts, as they appear in the common version, but not the shadow of a repugnancy to them, as expressed by the Evangelist. To be without anxiety, is most commonly the attendant of industry in our vocation, joined with an habitual trust in Providence, and acquiescence in its dispensations. The Vul. renders the words very properly, *Ne solliciti sitis*, and in this is followed by Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Pisc. and Cas. Ar. has adopted the

All these remarks arise from ignorance of the fact, that in old English to "take thought" is "be anxious". Though the expression may now be obsolete, it was certainly not a palpable deviation.

barbarous word *anxiemini*, in preference to the classical *cogitetis* (as the latter does not reach the sense,) that he might express in one word in his version, what was expressed in one word in Gr. It is true, that in v. 27. the Vul. renders the word *μεριμνων*, *cogitans*. But one who considers the taste in which the greater part of that version is composed, can be at no loss to assign the reason of his changing the word. The translator, though not so extravagantly attached to the letter, as Arias and Pagnin, yet, was attached to it, even to excess; and having no participle from the same root with *solicitus*, to answer to *μεριμνων*, chose rather to change the word for a weaker, and say *cogitans*, than either to alter the participial form of the expression, or to adopt a barbarous term. The latter of these methods was afterwards taken by Ar. who said, *anxiatus*; the former, which was the better method, by the rest. Er. Zu. Pisc. and Be. say, *solicite cogitando*. Cal. *anxie curando*. Cas. *sua solitudine*. No foreign version that I know, ancient or modern, agrees with the Eng. in this particular. As to the latter Eng. translations, suffice it to observe, that Wes.'s alone excepted, there is none of those I have seen, that does not use either *anxious* or *solicitous*. I have preferred the former, both as coming nearer the sense of the original, and as being in more familiar use. It may not be improper to observe, that Wy. has employed the term *over-solicitous*, which I think faulty in the other extreme. Solicitude, as I understand it, implies excess, and consequently some degree of distrust in Providence, and want of resignation. To say, *Be not over-solicitous*, is in effect to say, *Ye may be solicitous, if ye do not carry your solicitude too far*; a speech unbecoming both the speaker and the occasion. Dio. a very good translator, is perhaps reprehensible for the same error. *Non siate con ansieta sollecite*. We have, however, a most harmonious suffrage of translators, ancient and modern, against our common version in this instance. Some would say, that even Wes. might be included, who does not say, *Take no thought*, but *Take not thought*; for there is some difference between these expressions.

² *What ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink*, *τι φαγητε και τι πητε*. The words, *και τι πητε*, are wanting in two MSS. Likewise the Vul. Sax. and Eth. versions, have not this clause. But these are of no weight, compared with the evidence on the other side. It adds to this considerably, that when our Lord, in the

conclusion of his argument, v. 31st, expresses, for the last time, the precept he had been enforcing, both clauses are found in all the MSS. and versions.

³ *Or, καί.* This is one example in which the conjunction *καί* is, with equal propriety, translated into Eng. *or*. When the sentence contains a prohibition of two different things, it often happens that either way will express the sense. When the copulative, *and*, is used, the verb is understood as repeated. Thus: Be not anxious what ye shall eat : and be not anxious what ye shall drink. When the disjunctive, *or*, is used, it expresses with us rather more strongly, that the whole force of the prohibition equally affects each of the things mentioned ; as, *Be not anxious either what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink.* In the conjunction, *and*, in such cases, there is sometimes a slight ambiguity. Both the things mentioned may be prohibited, taken jointly, when it is not meant to prohibit them severally. Another instance of this kind, not perfectly similar, the critical reader will find, ch. vii. 6.

I shall here observe, by the way, that there are two extremes, to one or other of which most interpreters lean, in translating the instructions given by our Lord. Some endeavour to soften what to their taste is harsh ; and seem afraid of speaking out to the world, what the sacred historian has authorized them to say. Others on the contrary, imagining that moral precepts cannot be too rigorous, give generally the severest and most unnatural interpretation to every word than can admit more than one, and sometimes even affix a meaning (whereof *μεριμνα* is an instance) for which they have no authority, sacred or profane. There is a danger on each side, against which a faithful interpreter ought to be equally guarded. Our Lord's precepts are in the Oriental manner, concisely and proverbially expressed ; and we acknowledge, that all of them are not to be expounded by the moralist, strictly according to the letter. But whatever allowance may be made to the expositor or commentator, this is what the translator has no title to expect. The character just now given of our Lord's precepts, is their character in the original, as they were written by the inspired penmen for their contemporaries ; it is the translator's business to give them to his readers, as much as possible, stamped with the same signature with which they were given by the Evangelists to theirs. Those methods, therefore,

of enervating the expression, to render the doctrine more palatable to us moderns, and better suited to the reigning sentiments and manners, are not to be approved. I have given an instance of this fault in Wy. and Dio. I shall add another from the pious Dod. v. 39. *Εγω δε λεγω υμιν, μη αντιστηναι τω πονηρω*, he renders thus : *But I say unto you, that you do not set yourselves against the injurious person.* In this he is followed by Wor. and Wa. The phrase, *do not set yourself against a man*, if it means any thing, means, *do not become his enemy*, or do not act the part of an enemy ; a sense neither suited to the words, nor to the context. To pretend to support it from etymology, is no better than it would be to contend that *intelligo* should be translated, *I read between*, and *manumitto*, *I send with the hand* ; or (to recur to our own language, which answers equally well) to explain *I understand*, as denoting *I stand under*, or *I reflect*, as implying *I bend back*. The attempt was the more futile here, as every one of the three following examples, whereby our Lord illustrated his precept, sufficiently shows that the meaning of *αντιστηναι* (had the word been equivocal, as it is not) could be nothing else than as it is commonly rendered, *resist*, or *oppose*. The anonymous translator 1729. seems likewise to have disrelished this precept, rendering it, *Don't return evil for evil* ; a Christian precept doubtless, but not the precept of the text. Our Lord says expressly, and the whole context vouches his meaning, *Do not resist* ; his translator will have him to say, *Do not resent*. Jesus manifestly warns us against opposing an injury offered ; his interpreter will have him only to dissuade us from revenging an injury committed. Yet in the very interpretation which he gives of the following words, he has afforded an irrefragable evidence against himself, that it is of the former that Christ is speaking, and not of the latter.

But it must be owned, that there is danger also on the other side, to which our translators have, in rendering some passages evidently leaned. It is in vain to think to draw respect to a law, by straining it ever so little beyond what consistency and right reason will warrant. "Expect no good," says the Bishop of Meaux, "from those who overstrain virtue." *Ne croyez jamais rien de bon de ceux qui outrent la vertu.* Hist. des Variations, &c. liv. ii. ch. 60. Nothing can be better founded than this maxim, though it may justly surprise us to read it in that author, as

nothing can be more subversive of the whole fabric of monachism. There is not, however, a more effectual method, than by such immoderate stretches, of affording a shelter and apology for transgression. And when once the plea of impracticability is (though not avowedly, tacitly) admitted in some cases, it never fails to be gradually extended to other cases, and comes at last to undermine the authority of the whole. That this, to the great scandal of the Christian name, is become too much the way, in regard to our Lord's precepts, in all sects and denominations of Christians, is a truth too evident to admit a question.

27. *Prolong his life one hour.* L. xii. 25. N.

28. *Mark the lilies of the field. How do they grow?* Καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου πως αυξανει. So it is commonly pointed in the printed editions. But in the old MSS. there is no pointing. Nor are the points to be considered as resting on any other than human authority, like the division into chapters and verses. I agree, therefore, with Palairet, who thinks that there should be a full stop after αγρου, and that the remaining words should be marked as an interrogation, thus, Καταμαθετε τα κρινα του αγρου. Πως αυξανει; This perfectly suits both the scope of the place, and the vivacity of our Lord's manner, through the whole discourse.

30. *The herbage, τον χορτον.* E. T. *The grass.* But lilies are not grass; neither is grass fit for heating an oven. That the lily is here included under the term χορτος, is (if there were no other) sufficient evidence, that more is meant by it than is signified with us by the term *grass*. I acknowledge, however, that the classical sense of the Gr. word is *grass*, or *hay*. It is a just remark of Gro. that the Hebrews ranked the whole vegetable system under two classes, **עץ** *ghets*, and **קש** *ghesheb*. The first is rendered ξυλον, or δειδρον, *tree*; to express the second, the Seventy have adopted χορτος, as their common way was to translate one Heb. word by one Gr. word, though not quite proper, rather than by a circumlocution. It is accordingly used in their version Gen. i. 11 where the distinction first occurs, and in most other places. Nor is it with greater propriety rendered *grass* in Eng. than χορτος in Greek. The same division occurs Rev. viii. 7. where our translators have in like manner had recourse to the term *grass*. I have adopted, as coming nearer the meaning of the sa-

ered writer, the word *herbage*, which Johnson defines herbs' collectively. Under the name *herb* is comprehended every sort of plant which has not, like trees and shrubs, a perennial stalk. That many, if not all sorts of shrubs, were included, by the Hebrews, under the denomination *tree*, is evident from Jotham's apologue of the trees chusing a king, Jud. ix. 7. where the *bramble* is mentioned as one.

² *Into the oven*, εἰς τον κλιβανον. Wes. *into the still*. But on what authority, sacred or profane, κλιβανος is made *a still*, he does not acquaint us. For my part, I have not seen a vestige of evidence in any ancient author, that the art of distillation was then known. The only objection of moment, against the common version of κλιβανος, is removed by the former part of this note. Indeed, the scarcity of fuel in those parts, both formerly and at present, fully accounts for their having recourse to withered herbs for heating their ovens. It accounts, also, for the frequent recourse of the sacred penmen to those similitudes, whereby things, found unfit for any nobler purpose, are represented as reserved for the fire. See Harmer's Observations, ch. iv. obs. vi. As to the words *to-day* and *to-morrow*, every body knows that this is a proverbial idiom, to denote that the transition is sudden.

³ *O ye distrustful!* ολιγοπιστοι. E. T. *O ye of little faith!* It is quite in the genius of the Gr. language, to express, by such compound words, what in other languages is expressed by a more simple term. Nor do our translators, or indeed any translators, always judge it necessary to trace, in a periphrasis, the several parts of the composition. In a few cases, wherein a single word entirely adequate cannot be found, this method is proper, but not otherwise. I have seen no version which renders ολιγοψυχαι, *they of little soul*, or μακροθυμια, *length of mind*, or φιλονεικος, *a lover of quarrels*. How many are the words of this kind in the N. T. whose component parts no translator attempts to exhibit in his version? Such are, πλεονεξια, μεγαλοπρεπης, κληρονομεω, ειλικρινης, and many others. The word *distrustful* comes nearer the sense than the phrase *of little faith*; because this may express any kind of incredulity or scepticism; whereas anxiety about the things of life stands in direct opposition to an unshaken trust in the providence and promises of God.

33. *Seek—the righteousness required by him, ζητειτε—την δικαιοσυνην αυτου.* E. T. *Seek—his righteousness.* The *righteousness of God*, in our idiom, can mean only the justice or moral rectitude of the divine nature, which it were absurd in us to seek, it being, as all God's attributes are, inseparable from his essence. But in the Heb. idiom, that righteousness, which consists in a conformity to the declared will of God, is called *his righteousness*. In this way the phrase is used by Paul, Rom. iii. 21, 22. x. 3. where *the righteousness of God* is opposed by the Apostle to that of the unconverted Jews; and *their own righteousness*, which he tells us they went about to establish, does not appear to signify their personal righteousness, any more than the righteousness of God signifies his personal righteousness. The word *righteousness*, as I conceive, denotes there what we should call a system of morality, or righteousness, which he denominates their own, because fabricated by themselves, founded partly on the letter of the law, partly on tradition, and consisting mostly in ceremonies, and mere externals. This creature of their own imaginations they had cherished, to the neglect of that purer scheme of morality which was truly of God, which they might have learnt, even formerly, from the law and the Prophets properly understood, but now, more explicitly, from the doctrine of Christ. That the phrase, *the righteousness of God*, in the sense I have given, was not unknown to the O. T. writers, appears from Micalah vi. What is called, v. 5. *the righteousness of the Lord*, which God wanted that the people should know, is explained, v. 8. to be *what the Lord requireth* of them, namely, *to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God*. It is in this sense we ought to understand the phrase, James i. 20. *The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God*; that is, is not the proper means of producing that righteousness which God requireth of us. Now, *the righteousness of God*, meant in this discourse by our Lord, is doubtless what he had been explaining to them, and contrasting to *the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees*. The phrase, *seeking righteousness*, for seeking to attain a conformity to the will of God, is not unsuitable to the Jewish phraseology. The same expression occurs, 1 Macc. ii. 29. *Then many that sought after justice and judgment, ζητουυτες δικαιοσυνην και ζουμα, went down into the wilderness to dwell there.* And though this book is not admitted by Pro-

testants into the canon, it is acknowledged to have been written by a Jew, and entirely in the idiom of his country, if not originally in their language.

CHAPTER VII.

3. *The thorn*, τὴν δοκον. E. T. *The beam*. That the tropes employed by the Orientals often appear to Europeans rather too bold and hyperbolic, is beyond a doubt. But I cannot help thinking, that the effect has been, in many cases, heightened by translators, who, when a word admits different interpretations, seem sometimes to have preferred that which is worst suited to the figurative application. The Gr. word *δοκος* has, even in classical use, more latitude of signification than the Eng. term *beam*. It answers not only to the La. *trabs* or *tignum*, a *beam* or *rafter*, but also to *lancea*, *hasta*, a *spear* or *lance*. In the latter signification, when used figuratively, I take it to have been nearly synonymous to *σκολοψ*, which, from denoting *palus aculeatus*, *sudes*, *vallus*, seems, at least in the use of Hellenists, to have been employed to denote any thing sharp-pointed (however little), as a *prickle*, or *thorn*. Thus, in Num. xxxiii. 55. σκολοπες εν τοις οφθαλμοις υμων. E. T. *pricks in your eyes*; the Heb. term, to which σκολοπες answers, means no more than the Eng. makes it. The Gr. word is similarly rendered in the N. T. εδοθη μοι σκολοψ εν σαρκι; *there was given to me a thorn in the flesh*. The like may be remarked of *βολις*, answering to the La. words *jaculum*, *sagitta*, and to the Eng. *missile weapon*, of whatever kind, *javelin*, *dart*, or *arrow*. But in the Hellenistic use, it sometimes corresponds to Heb. words, denoting no more than *prickle*, or *thorn*. Thus in Jos. xxiii. 13. εις βολιδας εν τοις οφθαλμοις υμων; E. T. *thorns in your eyes*, the word *βολις* is put for a Heb. term which strictly means *thorn*. It is therefore evident that *δοκος* is used here by the same trope, and in the same meaning with *σκολοψ* and *βολις* in the places above quoted. And it is not more remote from our idiom to speak of a *pole* or a *javelin* than to speak of a *beam* in the eye. Nor is a greater liberty taken in rendering *δοκος* *thorn*, than in rendering *βολις* or *σκολοψ* in that manner.

6. *Or*, και. This is one of the cases wherein *και* is better rendered *or* in our language than *and*. The two evils mentioned are

not ascribed to both sorts of animals ; the latter is doubtless applied to the *dogs*, the former to the *swine*. The conjunction *and* would here, therefore, be equivocal. Though the words are not in the natural order, the sense cannot be mistaken.

8. *For whosoever asketh obtaineth ; whosoever seeketh findeth.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 29.

9. *Who amongst you men, τις εστιν εξ υμων ανθρωπος.* E. T. *What man is there of you.* There is evidently an emphasis in the word *ανθρωπος*, otherwise it is superfluous ; for *τις εστιν εξ υμων* is all that is necessary ; its situation at the end of the clause is another proof of the same thing. The word *ανθρωπος* here makes the intended illustration of the goodness of the celestial Father, from the conduct of even human fathers, with all their imperfections much more energetic. I think this not sufficiently marked in the common version ; for *what man* is hardly any more than a translation of *τις*.

14. *How strait is the gate.* In the common Gr. we read, *οτι στενη η πυλη*. But in a very great number of MSS. some of them of great antiquity, the reading is *τι* not *οτι*. This reading is confirmed by the Vul. *Quam angusta porta*, and by most of the ancient versions, particularly by the old Itc. both the Sy. the Ara. the Cop. the Go. and the Sax. It was so read by Chr. The. and the most eminent Fathers, Gr. and La. and is received by Wet. and some of the best modern critics.

15. *False teachers, ψευδοπροφητων.* E. T. *False prophets.* But *προφητης* not only means a prophet, in our sense of the word, one divinely inspired, and able to foretel future events, but also a teacher in divine things. When it is used in the plural with the article, and refers to those of former times, it always denotes the prophets in the strictest sense. On most other occasions it means simply a teacher of religious truths, and consequently *ψευδοπροφητης* a false teacher in religion. This is especially to be regarded as the sense, in a warning which was to serve for the instruction of his disciples in every age. I have, for the same reason, translated *προεφητευσαμεν*, v. 22. *taught* ; which, notwithstanding its connection with things really miraculous, is better rendered thus in this passage, because to promote the knowledge of the Gospel is a matter of higher consequence, and would therefore seem more to recommend men than to foretel things future.

² *In the garb of sheep, εν ενδυμασι προβατων.* Si. renders it, *Couverts de peaux de brebis*, and says in a note, "It is thus we ought to translate *indumentis ovium*, because the prophets were clothed with *sheep-skins*." It is true the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 37. in enumerating the great things which have been done and suffered, through faith, by prophets, and other righteous persons, mentions this, that they wandered about in *sheep-skins* and *goat-skins*, *μηλωταις και αιγειοις δερμασιν*, *being destitute, afflicted, tormented*, alluding to the persecutions to which many of them were exposed from idolatrous princes. That Elijah was habited in this manner, appears from 2 Ki. i. 7, 8. compared with ch. ii. 13. and 1 Ki. xix. 13. in which two last places, the word rendered in Eng. *mantle*, is, in the Sep. translated *μηλωτη*. But I have not seen any reason to think that this was the common attire of the prophets. The first of the three passages serves as evidence, rather of the contrary, inasmuch as Elijah seems to have been distinguished by his dress, not only from other men, but from other prophets. That some indeed came afterwards hypocritically to affect a similar garb, in order to deceive the simple, is more than probable, from Zech. xiii. 4. But, whatever be in this, as *ενδυμα* does not signify a skin, there is no reason for making the expression in the translation more limited than in the original.

17. *Evil tree, σαπρον δενδρον.* E. T. *Corrupt tree.* The word *σαπρος* does not always mean *rotten* or *corrupted*, but is often used as synonymous to *πονηρος*, *evil*. Trees of a bad kind produce bad fruit, but not in consequence of any rottenness or corruption. See ch. xiii. 48, where, in the similitude of the net, which enclosed fishes of every kind, the worthless, which were thrown away, are called *τα σαπρα*, rendered in the common version *the bad*. Nothing can be plainer than that this epithet does not denote that those fishes were *putrid*, but solely that they were of a noxious or poisonous quality, and consequently *useless*.

23. *I never knew you ; that is, I never acknowledged you for mine.*

² *Ye who practise iniquity, οι εργαζομενοι την ανομιαν.* Be. *Qui operam datis iniquitati.* Diss. X. P. V. § 12.

28. *At his manner of teaching, επι τη διδαχη αυτου. E. T. At his doctrine.* The word *διδαχη* denotes often *the doctrine* taught, sometimes *the act* of teaching, and sometimes even *the manner* of teaching. That this is the import of the expression here, is evident from the verse immediately following.

29. *As the Scribes.* The Vul. Sy. Sax. and Arm. versions, with one MS. add, *and the Pharisecs.*

CHAPTER VIII.

4. The Sy. says, *the priests*, but in this reading is singular.

² *For notifying the cure to the people, εις μαρτυριον αυταις. E. T. For a testimony unto them.* Both the sense and the connection show that the *them* here means *the people*. It could not be *the priests*, for it was only one priest (to wit, *the priest* then entrusted with that business) to whom he was commanded to go. Besides, the oblation could not serve as an evidence to the priest. On the contrary, it was necessary that he should have ocular evidence by an accurate inspection in private, before the man was admitted into the temple and allowed to make the oblation; but his obtaining this permission, and the solemn ceremony consequent upon it, was the public testimony of the priest, the only legal judge, to the people, that the man's uncleanness was removed. This was a matter of the utmost consequence to the man, and of some consequence to them. Till such testimony was given, he lived in a most uncomfortable seclusion from society. No man durst, under pain of being also secluded, admit him into his house, eat with him, or so much as touch him. The antecedent therefore to the pronoun *them*, though not expressed, is easily supplied by the sense. To me it is equally clear, that the only thing meant to be attested by the oblation was the cure. The suppositions of some commentators on this subject are quite extravagant. Nothing can be more evident than that the person now cleansed was not permitted to give any testimony to the priest, or to any other, concerning the manner of his cure, or the person by whom it had been performed. *Ορα μηδεν ειπης, See thou tell nobody.* The prohibition is expressed by the Evangelist Mr. in still stronger terms. Prohibitions of this kind were often transgressed by those who received them; but that is not a good reason for representing our Lord as giving contradictory orders.

6. *Afflicted*, βαβαιζομενος. E. T. *Tormented*. The Greek word is not confined, especially in the Hellenistic idiom, to this signification, but often denotes simply (as has been observed by Gro. and Ham.) *afflicted*, or *distressed*. Palsies are not attended with torment.

13. *That instant*, εν τη ωρα εκεινη. E. T. *In the self-same hour*. But ωρα does not always mean *hour*. This is indeed the meaning when it is joined with a number, whether ordinal or cardinal; as, He went out about *the third hour*, and, Are there not *twelve hours* in the day? On other occasions it more commonly denotes the precise time, as, *Mine hour is not yet come*.

15. *Him*. The common Gr. copies have αυτοις *them*. But the reading is αυτω in a great number of MSS. several of them ancient; it is supported also by some of the old versions and fathers, is approved by Mill and Wet. and is more agreeable than the other to the words in construction, none but Jesus having been mentioned in the preceding words.

17. *Verifying the saying of the prophet*. We have here a remarkable example of the latitude in which the word πληρωω is used. Ch. i. 22. N. In our sense of the term *fulfilling*, we should rather call that the *fulfilment* of this prophecy, which is mentioned 1 Pet. iv. 24. I have, in translating the quotation, rendered *εκαθε carried off*, of which the original Heb. as well as the Gr. is capable, that the words, as far as propriety admits, may be conformable to the application.

18. *To pass to the opposite shore*. Let it be remarked, once for all, that *passing* or *crossing* this lake or sea, does not always denote sailing from the east side to the west, or inversely; though the river Jordan, both above and below the lake, ran southwards. The lake was of such a form, that, without any impropriety, it might be said to be crossed in other directions, even by those who kept on the same side of the Jordan.

19. *Rabbi*, διδασκαλε. Diss. VII. P. II.

20. *Caverns*, φωλεους. The word φωλεος denotes *the den*, *cavern*, or *kennel*, which a wild beast, by constantly haunting it, appropriates to himself.

² *Places of shelter*, κατασκηνωσεις. E. T. *Nests*. But κατασκηνωσις signifies a place for shelter and repose, *a perch*, or *roost*.

The Gr. name for *nest*, or place for hatching, is *νοσθια*, which occurs often in this sense in the Sep. as *ενοσθευω* does for *to build a nest*. But *κατασκηνωσις* is never so employed. The verb *κατασκηνω* is used by the Evangelists Mt. Mr. and L. speaking of birds, to express their *taking shelter, perching, or roosting* on branches. In the common version it is rendered by the verb *to lodge*.

22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* This expression is evidently figurative; the word *dead* having one meaning in the beginning of the sentence, and another in the end. The import is, 'Let the *spiritually dead*, those who are no better than dead, 'being insensible to the concerns of the soul and eternity, employ 'themselves in burying those who, in the common acceptation of 'the word are *dead*.'

26. *Commanded, επετιμησε.* Mr. ix. 25. N.

28. *Gadarenes.* I agree with Wet. that *Gergesenes* appears to have been introduced by Origen upon mere conjecture. Origen's words imply as much. Before him most copies seem to have read *Gadarenes*, but some *Gerasenes*. The latter is the reading of the Vul. and of the second Sy. The former is preferable on many accounts, and is the reading of the first Sy. I shall only add, that if Origen's conjectural correction were to be admitted, it ought to be extended to the parallel places in Mr. and L.

² *Demoniacs.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 7, &c.

29. *What hast thou to do with us?* *τι ημιν και σοι.* E. T. *What have we to do with thee?* The sense of both expressions is the same. But the first is more in the form of expostulation. J. ii. 4. ² N.

30. *At some distance, μακρον.* E. T. *A good way off.* Vul. *Non longé* probably from some copy which read *ου μακρον*. This is one of those differences wherein there is more the appearance of discrepancy than the reality. In such general ways of speaking, there is always a tacit comparison; and the same thing may be denominated *far*, or *not far*, according to the extent of ground with which, in our thoughts, we compare it. *At some distance* suits perfectly the sense of the Gr. word in this place, is conformable to the rendering given in the Sy. and makes no difference in the meaning from the La. The word *μακροθεν* (L. xviii.

13.) where it is said of the Publican *μακροθιν ἐστως*, must be understood in the same way. *Afar off*, as it is rendered in the E. T. sounds oddly in our ears, when we reflect that both the Pharisee and the Publican were in the outer court of the temple, on the same side of the court, and in sight of each other, at least, if not within hearing.

CHAPTER IX.

2. *Thy sins are forgiven thee*, *αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτια σου*. E. T. *Thy sins be forgiven thee*. The words are an affirmation, not a prayer or wish. As a prayer, the Scribes would not have objected to them. At the time the common version was made, the words *be forgiven* were equivocal, they would now be improper. At that time *be* was often used in the indicative plural, for what we always say at present *are*. But even then, it would have been better, in this instance, to say *are*, which was also used, and would have totally removed the ambiguity.

3. *This man blasphemeth*. Diss. X. P. II. § 14.

5. *Thy sins are forgiven*, *αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτια*. But there is a small difference of reading here. Many MSS. amongst which are some of principal note, have *σου* instead of *σοι*, a few have both pronouns. Agreeable to these last are the Vul. both the Sy. Ara. Eth. and Sax. I have followed, with Wet. that which seems best supported by number and antiquity.

² *Or to say [with effect,] Arise and walk*. The supply of the words in this clause, is, if not necessary, at least, convenient, for showing more clearly the scope of the sentiment. Merely to say, that is, to pronounce the words of either sentence, is, no doubt, equally easy to any one. And to say both with effect were equally easy to our Lord. Now, if the former only was said, *Thy sins are forgiven*, the effect was invisible, and for aught the people could know, there might be no effect at all. But to say to a man manifestly disabled by palsy, *Arise and walk*, when instantly the man, in the sight of all present, arises and walks, is an ocular demonstration of the power with which the order was accompanied, and therefore was entirely fit for serving as evidence, that the other expression he had used, was not vain words, but attended with the like divine energy, though from its nature, not discoverable like the other, by its consequences. To say the one with effect whose effect was visible is

a proof, that the other was said also with effect, though the effect itself was invisible. This is the use which our Lord makes of this cure, v. 6. *But that ye may know, &c.*

8. *Wondered, εθαυμασαν.* Vul. *Timuerunt.* This doubtless arises from a different reading. Accordingly *φοβηθησαν* is found in three or four MSS. agreeable to which are also the Sy. the Go. the Sax. and the Cop. versions. The common reading not only has the advantage in point of evidence, but is more clearly connected with the context. ε

9. *At the toll-office, επι το τελωνιον.* E. T. *At the receipt of custom.* But the word *receipt* in this sense seems now to be obsolete. Some late translators say *at the custom-house.* But have we any reason to think it was a house? The Sy. name is no evidence that it was; for, like the Hebrews, they use the word *beth*, especially in composition, with great latitude of signification. Most probably it was a temporary stall or moveable booth, which could easily be erected in any place where occasion required. The name *tollbooth*, which Ham. seems to have preferred, would at present be very unsuitable, as that word, however well adapted in point of etymology, is now confined to the meaning of *jail* or *prison*. The word *office*, for a place where any particular business is transacted, whether within doors or without, is surely unexceptionable.

10. *At table.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

13. *I require humanity, ελεον θελω.* E. T. *I will have mercy.* But this last expression in Eng. means properly, *I will exercise mercy.* In the prophet here referred to, our translators had rendered the verb much better, *I desired.* They ought not to have changed the word here.

² *Humanity.* E. T. *Mercy.* The Gr. word commonly answers, and particularly in this passage, to a Heb. term of more extensive signification than *mercy*, which, in strictness, denotes only clemency to the guilty and the miserable. This sense (though Phavorinus thinks otherwise) is included in *ελεος*, which is sometimes properly translated *mercy*, but it is not all that is included. And in an aphorism, like that quoted in the text, it is better to interpret the word in its full latitude. The Heb. term employed by the prophet

Hosea, in the place quoted, is ἡσπ *chesed*, a general name for all the kind affections. See D. VI. P. IV. § 18.

³ *And not sacrifice, for more than sacrifice*, a noted Hebraism.

⁴ *To reformation, εις μετανοιαν*. These words are wanting in a good many MSS. There is nothing to correspond to them in the Vul. Sy. Go. Sax. and Eth. versions. Critics are divided about them. To me there scarcely appears sufficient evidence for rejecting them. Besides, it is allowed by all, that if they be not expressed in this place, they are understood.

15. *Bridemen*. Mr. ii. 19. N.

16. *Undressed cloth, ραζους αγναφου*. E. T. *New cloth*. That this gives in effect the same sense cannot be doubted, as it answers literally to the expression used by L. who says *ιματιον καινον*. But as the expressions are different, and not even synonymous; I thought it better to allow each Evangelist to express himself in his own manner.

17. *Old leathern bottles, αβζους παλαιους*. E. T. *Old bottles*. *Αβζος* is properly a vessel for holding liquor. Such vessels were commonly then, and in some countries are still, of leather, which were not easily distended when -old, and were consequently more ready to burst by the fermentation of the liquor. As this does not hold in regard to the bottles used by us, I thought it better, in translating, to add a word denoting the materials of which their vessels were made.

18. *Is by this time dead, αρτι ετελευτησεν*. E. T. *Is even now dead*. Philostrat. *αρτι, περι τον καιρον των ρηματων*. *By this time dead*, a natural conjecture concerning one whom he had left a-dying. As the words are evidently susceptible of this interpretation, candour requires that it be preferred, being the most conformable to the accounts of this miracle given by the other historians.

20. *The tuft of his mantle, του κρασπεδου του ιματιου αυτου*. E. T. *The hem of his garment*. The Jewish mantle, or upper garment, was considered as consisting of four quarters, called in the Oriental idiom *wings, πετερυγια*. Every wing contained one corner, whereat was suspended a *tuft* of threads or strings, which they called *κρασπεδον*. See Num. xv. 37. Deut. xxii. 12. What are there called *fringes* are those *strings*, and the four quarters of the vesture are the four *corners*. In the Sy. version the word is

rendered כַּרְנַיִם, *karna*, *corner*. As in the first of the passages above referred to, they are mentioned as serving to make them remember the commandments of the Lord to do them, there was conceived to be a special sacredness in them (see ch. xxiii. 5.), which must have probably led the woman to think of touching that part of his garment rather than any other. They are not properly, says Lamy, *des franges* in our language, but *des houpes*. See his description of them and of the phylacteries, *Commentarius in Harmoniam*, lib. v. cap. xi. Sc. has rendered it in this place *fringe*; but this word answers worse than *hem*, for their garments had no *fringes*.

27. *Son of David*. This was probably meant as acknowledging him to be the Messiah; for at this time it appears to have been universally understood that the Messiah would be a descendant of David.

30. *Their eyes were opened*. A Heb. idiom, neither remote nor inelegant, to denote, *They received their sight*.

² *Strictly charging them, said* ἐνεβριμησατο αυτοις λεγων. Vul. *Comminatus est illis, dicens*. Si. who translates from the Vul. says, *Leur dit, en les menaçant rudement*; where, instead of softening the harsh words of his author, the La. translator, he has rendered them still harsher. In another place, Mr. i. 43, ἐμβριμησαμενος αυτω λεγει is thus expressed in his translation, *en lui disant avec de fortes menaces*. It is strange that, when the very words used by our Lord, on both these occasions, are related by the Evangelist, in which there is nothing of either threat or harshness, an interpreter should imagine that this is implied in the verb. Si. may use for his apology that he translates from the Vul. The Sy. translator, who understood better the Oriental idiom, renders the Gr. verb by a word in Sy. which implies simply *he forbade, he prohibited*. Mr. ix. 25. N.

35. *Among the people, εν τω λαω*. This clause is wanting in many MSS. in the Vul. the Sy. and most other ancient versions. As in this case the evidence on the opposite sides may be said to balance each other, and as the admission or the rejection makes no alteration in the sense; that the clause possesses a place in the common Gr. editions, and in the E. T. is here sufficient ground for deciding in its favour.

36. *He had compassion upon them, εβλαγγιςθη περι αυτον*. E. T. *He was moved with compassion on them*. Vul. *Misertus*

est eis. Be. imagining there was something particularly expressive in the Greek verb here used, has rendered this clause *commiseratione intima commotus est super eis*, and is followed by Pisc. Er. seems to have had in some degree the same notion. He says, *Affectu misericordiæ, tactus est erga illos*, and is followed by Cal. Leo de Juda adds only *intimé* to *misertus est*. Cas. has preferred the unaffected simplicity of the Vul. and said *misertus est eorum*. Lu. has taken the same method. Be.'s opinion had great weight with the Protestant translators of that age who came after him. Dio. says, *Sene mosse a gran pieta.* G. F. *Il fut esmeu de compassion envers icelles*, which is literally the same with our common version, and which has also been adopted by L. Cl. The P. R. translators, *Ses entrailles furent emues de compassion.* Sa. after the Vul. says simply, *Il en eut compassion.* Si. to the same purpose, *Il en eut pitié.* So does Beau. who translates from the Gr. Of the late Eng. translations, An. Dod. Wor. and Wa. follow the common version. Wes. has chosen to go beyond it, *He was moved with tender compassion for them.* But Wy. has in this way outstript them all, *His bowels yearned with compassion on them.* Sc. and Hey. render the expression as I do. Those strange efforts to say something extraordinary result from an opinion founded on etymology, of the signification of the Gr. word *σπλαγχνιζομαι* from *σπλαγχνα*, *viscera, the bowels.* This they consider as corresponding to the Heb. *richam*, both noun and verb. The noun in the plural is sometimes interpreted, *σπλαγχνα.* The verb is never by the Seventy rendered *σπλαγχνιζομαι*, a word which does not occur in that version, but generally *ελεω* or *οικτειρω*, which occur often, and are rendered *I have compassion, I have mercy, or I have pity.* Nay, the Heb. word frequently occurs joined with a negative particle, manifestly denoting to have no mercy, &c. Now for this purpose the verb *richam* would be totally unfit, if it signified to be affected with an uncommon degree of compassion; all that would be then implied in it, when joined with a negative, would be, that an uncommon degree of compassion was not shown. In the historical part of the N. T. where the word *σπλαγχνιζομαι* occurs pretty often, and always in the same sense, not one of those interpreters who in this passage find it so wonderfully emphatical, judge it proper always to adhere to their method of rendering adopted here, but render it barely *I have compassion.* Even Wes. who has

been more uniform than the rest, has thought fit to desert his favourite phrase, in translating Mr. ix. 22. where the man who brought his son to Jesus to be cured, says, as he renders it, *If thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us*, *σπλαγχνισθεις εφ' ημας*, and *help us*. So also says Wy. Both have been sensible that *emotions of tender compassion*, and *the yearning of the bowels*, would make an awkward and affected figure in this place. The plea from etymology, in a point which ought to be determined solely by use, where use can be discovered, is very weak. If I should render this expression in Cicero, *stomachabatur, si quid asperius dixerin*; if I happened to use a severe expression, instantly *his stomach was disordered with vexation*, I believe I should be thought to translate ridiculously. And yet the last clause is exactly in the same taste with *his bowels yearned with compassion*. The style of the Evangelists is chaste and simple; no effort in them to say extraordinary things, or in an extraordinary manner. The diction, if not, when judged by the rhetorician's rules, pure and elegant, is however natural, easy, and modest. Though they did not seek out fine words, the plainest, and, to that class of people with whom they were conversant, the most obvious, came unsought. They aimed at no laboured antitheses, no rounded periods, no ambitious epithets, no accumulated superlatives. There is a naked beauty in their manner which is entirely their own. And with all the faults of the Vul. the barbarisms and solecisms with which it is chargeable, it has, in many places, more of that beautiful but unadorned simplicity than most modern translations. I should not have been at so much pains, where there is no material difference of meaning, but to take an occasion of showing, once for all, how idly some bestow their labour, hunting after imaginary emphasis, through the obscure mazes of etymology; a method which, in explaining any author in any language, could, with the greatest facility, be employed to make him say what he never formed a conception of. Diss. IV. § 26.

² *They were scattered and exposed*, *ησαν εκλελυμενοι και ερριμμενοι*. E. T. *They fainted and were scattered abroad*. It is acknowledged that in a very great number of MSS. the word is not *εκλελυμενοι*, but *εσχυλμενοι*. In regard to the reading in those copies, from which the Vul. and other ancient translations were

made, this is one of those cases in which nothing can be concluded with certainty. The reason is, one of the senses of the word *εκλελυμενοι*, namely, *fatigued, exhausted*, nearly coincides with the meaning of *εσχυλμενοι*; consequently the version might have been the same, whichever way it stood in the translator's copy. Now if these translations be set aside, the preponderancy is not such as ought in reason to determine us against the reading which suits best the context. To me the common reading appears, in this respect, preferable. Now the word *εκλυω*, when applied either to a flock or to a multitude of people, means *dissipo, I scatter*, as well as *debilito, I weaken*; nor can any thing be better suited to the scope of the passage. Be. has preferred that sense, and Elsner has well supported it, as he has, in like manner, the true meaning of *ερριμμενοι* in this place, as signifying *exposed*. This interpretation has also the advantage of being equally adapted to the literal sense, and to the figurative; to the similitude introduced, and to that with which the comparison is made. It is not a natural consequence of the absence of the shepherd that the sheep should be *fatigued and worn out, or languid*, but it is the consequence that they should be *scattered and exposed* to danger. The shepherd prevents their wandering, and protects them.

CHAPTER X.

2. *Apostles, αποστολων*. That is *missionaries, messengers*. It is rarely applied to any but those whom God, or one representing his person, as the chief magistrate or the high priest, sends on business of importance. The word occurs only once in the Septuagint. 1 Ki. xiv. 6. where Ahijah the prophet is, by those interpreters, represented as saying to the wife of Jeroboam, *Εγω ειμι αποστολος προς σε σκληρος*. After the captivity, in our Lord's time, the term was applied to those whom the high priest chose for counsellors, and to whom he commonly gave commission to collect the tribute payable to the temple from the Jews in distant regions. It continued in use, as we learn from Jerom, after the destruction of the temple and dispersion of the people by Titus Vespasian. Thus, accounting for the expression used by Paul, Gal. i. 1. he says, "Usque hodie a patriarchis Judæorum "apostolos mitti constat. Ad distinctionem itaque eorum qui "mittuntur, ab hominibus et sui, qui sit missus a Christo, tale

“sumpsit exordium, *Paulus apostolus, non ab hominibus, neque per hominem.*” We may add that in the N. T. the term is once applied to Jesus Christ himself, Heb. iii. 1. Some are denominated, 2 Cor. viii. 23. *αποστολοι εκκλησιων.* But the denomination, *Apostles of Christ*, seems to have been given to none but the twelve, Matthias who was substituted in the place of Judas, and Paul and Barnabas who were commissioned to the Gentiles. J. x. 36.

² *The first Simon, πρωτος Σιμων.* Though the Gr. here has no article, it is necessary to translate it *the first*, otherwise the word *first* would be an adverb, and could answer only to *πρωτον.*

³ *James, Ιακωβος.* The name is the same with that of the Patriarch; but immemorial custom has appropriated in our language the name *James* to the two Apostles, and *Jacob* to the Patriarch. Diss. XII. P. III. § 13.

⁴ *James, son of Zebedee, Ιακωβος ο του Ζεβεδαιου.* And,

3. *James, son of Alphaeus, Ιακωβος ο του Αλφαιου.* In both the above instances the Gr. article serves merely for supplying the ellipsis. It occupies the place of *υιος*, and is therefore more justly rendered *son* than *the son.* Ch. i. 6. N.

4. *Cananite, Κανανιτης.* E. T. *Canaanite.* But this is the name, always given in the O. T. to a descendant of Canaan, son of Ham, and grandson of Noah; and is in Gr. not *Κανανιτης* but *Χαναναιος.* The Vul. indeed seems to have read so, rendering it *Chananæus.* But this reading is not supported by either versions or MSS. nor has it any internal probability to recommend it. Some think the Gr. word imports a native or inhabitant of *Cana* in Galilee. Others are of opinion that it is a Sy. word used by Mt. and Mr. of the same import with the Gr. *ξηλωτης* employed by L. in reference to the same person. L. vi. 15. N.

² *He who betrayed him, ο και παραδους αυτον.* Vul. *Qui et tradidit eum.* Er. Zu. Be. Cas. Pisc. and Cal. all use *prodidit*, instead of *tradidit.* All modern translators I am acquainted with (except Beau. and Si. who say, *qui livra Jesus*), whether they translate from the Gr. or from the Vul. have in this particular followed the modern La. interpreters. Now it is evident that in this the Vul. has adhered more closely both to the letter and to the spirit of the original than the other versions. *Παραδουναι*, Wet. observes is *tradere*, *προδουναι* is *prodere.* The former expresses simply the fact, without any note of praise or blame; the other

marks the fact as criminal, and is properly a term of reproach. Now there is this peculiarity in the spirit of those writers, that, when speaking in their own character as historians, they satisfy themselves with relating the bare facts, without either using such terms, or affixing such epithets, as might serve to impress their readers with their sentiments concerning them, either of censure or of commendation. They tell the naked truth, without hinting an opinion, and leave the truth to speak for itself. They have hit the happy medium, in narrative writing, that they avoid equally the slightest appearance, on one hand, of coldness and indifference, and on the other, of passion and prejudice. It was said of their Master, *Never man spake like this man*. May it not be justly affirmed of these his biographers, *Never men wrote like these men*? And if their manner be unlike that of other men in general, it is more especially unlike that of fanatics of all denominations. Some may be surprized, after reading this remark, that I have not myself used the more general expression, and said, *Delivered him up*. Had I been the first who rendered the Gospels into Eng. I should certainly have so rendered that passage. But the case is totally different, now that our ears are inured to another dialect, especially as the customary expression contains nothing but what is strictly true. It is not easy to make so great an alteration, and at the same time preserve a simple and unaffected manner of writing. A translator, by appearing to seek about for an unusual term, may lose more of the genius of the style in one way than he gains in another. There is the greater danger in regard to this term, as, for the same reason for which we render it *deliver up* in this passage, we ought to translate it so in every other, which in some places, in consequence of our early habits, would sound very awkwardly. But that the manner of the evangelists may not be in any degree mistaken from the version, I thought it necessary to add this note. Diss. III. § 23.

5. *A Samaritan city, πολιν Σαμαρειτων*. Vul. *civitates Samaritanorum* in the plural. This reading has no support from MSS. or versions.

8. In the common Gr. copies, *νεκρους ἐγειρετε*, *raise the dead*, is found immediately after *λεπρους καθαριζετε*. But, it is wanting in a great number of the most valuable MSS. in the com. polyglot, and in the Arm. and Eth. versions. And, though it is retained

in the Sy. and also in the Vul. where it is transposed, it is evident that Jerom did not find it in any of his best MSS. as he has omitted it totally in his Commentary, where every other clause of the sentence is specially taken notice of. Neither did Chr. Euth. or Theo. find it in the copies used by them. There is this further evidence against it, that it is not mentioned, either in the beginning of the chapter, where the powers conferred on the Apostles are related, whereof this, had it been granted, must be considered as the principal; or in the parallel passages of L. where the Apostles are said to have been commissioned, and to have had powers bestowed on them. This power they seem never to have received till after the resurrection of their Lord.

9. *In your girdles.* Their purses were commonly in their girdles.

10. *No scrip, μη πήραν εις ὄδον.* E. T. *No scrip for your journey.* I understand *scrip* to signify a travelling bag or wallet, and consequently to answer to *πήρα εις ὄδον*. But whatever be in this, the words in connection sufficiently show the meaning.

² *Staves.* The common reading in Gr. is *ραβδον*. This is one of the few instances in which our translators have not scrupled to desert the ordinary editions, and say *staves*, notwithstanding that the Vul. agrees with the common Gr. and has *virgam*. There is sufficient ground, however, for preferring the other reading, which is not only well supported by MSS. some versions, and old editions, and is approved by Wet. and other critics; but is entirely conformable to those instructions as represented by the other Evangelists.

³ *No spare coats, shoes, or staves, μηδε δυο χιτωνας, μεδε υποδηματα, μηδε ραβδον.* E. T. *Neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves.* I consider the word *δυο* as equally belonging to all the three articles here conjoined, coats, shoes, and staves. Now, as it would be absurd to represent it as Christ's order, *Take not with you two shoes*; and as the Heb. word rendered in the Sep. *υποδηματα* is Am. ii. 6. and viii. 6. properly translated *a pair of shoes*, being, according to the Masora, in the dual number, I have rendered the word *δυο* here *spare*; (that is, such as ye are not using at present), for by this means I both avoid the impropriety, and exactly hit the sense in them all.

⁴ *Of his maintenance, της τροφης αυτου. E. T. Of his meat.* But the three particulars last mentioned, *coat, staff, and shoes*, are surely not *meat*, in any sense of the word. This, if there were no other argument, sufficiently shows, that our Lord included more under the term *τροφη* than *food*. He prohibits them from incumbering themselves with any articles of raiment, beside what they were wearing, or with money to purchase more, when these should be worn out. Why? Because they would be entitled to a supply from those on whom their labours would be bestowed, and money would be but an incumbrance to them. The word is used by a synecdoche, perfectly agreeable to the Oriental idiom, which sometimes makes the term *bread* denote every thing necessary for subsistence. Sc. has shown that this interpretation of *τροφη* is not unsupported by classical authority.

12. The Vul. subjoins to this verse, *Dicentes, Pax huic domui, Saying, Peace be to this house.* The corresponding words in Gr. are found in some MSS. but not in so many as to give any countenance for relinquishing the common reading, which agrees with the Sy. and the greater number of ancient versions; more especially, as some editions of the Vul. omit these words, and as the connection is complete without them. There is ground to think, that such corrections have sometimes arisen from an ill-judged zeal in transcribers, to render the Gospels more conformable to one another. That the common Jewish salutation was, *Peace be to this house*, is well known. I have, therefore, for the greater perspicuity, rendered *η ειρηνη υμων*, in the 13th verse, *the peace ye wish them.* This, at the same time that it gives exactly the sense, renders the addition to the 12th verse quite unnecessary.

14. *Shake the dust off your feet.* It was maintained by the scribes, that the very dust of a heathen country polluted their land, and therefore ought not to be brought into it. Our Lord here, adopting their language, requires his disciples, by this action, to signify that those Jewish cities which rejected their doctrine, deserved a regard noway superior to that which they themselves showed to the cities of Pagans. It is added in the gospels of Mr. and L. *εις μαρτυριον*, *for a testimony*, that is, not a denunciation of judgments, but a public and solemn *protestation against them.*

18. *To bear testimony to them, εις μαρτυριον αυτους.* Mr. xiii. 9. N.

20. *It shall not be ye—but—* The meaning is, *It shall not be ye so much as—* Ch. ix. 13. ³ Note.

23. *When they persecute you in one city, όταν διωκωσιν υμας εν τη πολει ταυτη.* Two or three copies, none of the most esteemed, read *εκ της πολεως ταυτης.* Chr. and Orig. also, found this reading in those used by them. But neither the author of the Vul. nor any ancient translator, appears to have read so. Had there been ground for admitting this reading, the proper translation would have been, *When they banish you out of one city.*

² *Another.* Ch. xxvii. 61. N.

³ *Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, ου μη τελεσητε τας πολεις του Ισραηλ.* Be. *Nequaquam obieritis urbes Israelis.* The late learned Bishop Pearce objects to this version that, though *τελειν οδον,* and *τελειν* alone (*οδον* being understood), are used for accomplishing a journey; he had seen no example of *τελειν πολεις,* for going over, or travelling through, towns. It is sufficient to answer, that we have seen no example of his sense of the word, adapted to the phrase here used; for *τελειν μυστηρια,* and *τελειν τινι απορηητα,* are at least as dissimilar to *τελειν πολιν,* as *τελειν οδον* is. Besides, there is nothing in the scriptural style resembling that of the Pagans, when speaking of what they called their mysteries; though I acknowledge that a great deal of this sort is to be found in the ecclesiastical writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who affected to accommodate the Pagan phraseology to the Christian doctrine and worship, which they not a little corrupted thereby. But nothing serves more strongly to evince, that the sense which Be. has given to the words is the natural and obvious sense, than the manner in which Chr. explains this passage. He does not seem to have discovered, that the word *τελειν,* joined with *πολιν,* had any thing either difficult or uncommon in it; but observing the encouragement given to the Apostles in the promise, he thus expresses in his own words, as is usual with him, the import of it, *ου φθασετε περιελθοντες την Παλαιδινεν,* *Ye shall not have finished your travelling through Palestine.* I shall only add, that the word *consummabitis* used by the Vul. is rather ambiguous, and may be differently interpreted. Er. Zu. and Cal. who say *perambuleritis,* perfectly agree in sense with Be. So, I imagine, does Cas. though he uses the more indefinite and less proper term, *perlustraveritis.*

25. *Beelzebub*, Βεελζεβουλ. Vul. *Beelzebub*. In this instance, our translators have adopted the reading of the Vul. in preference to that of the Gr. With the Vul. agree the Sy. Eth. and Ara. versions. It is remarkable, that there is no variation in the Gr. MSS. all of which make the word terminate in λ, not in β. All the learned seem to be agreed, that Beelzebub was the Oriental name. It were superfluous to examine the conjectures of critics on this subject. The obvious reason of this change appears to be that assigned by Gro. No Gr. word ends in β; and those who wrote in that language, in order to accommodate themselves to the pronunciation of the people who spoke it, were accustomed to make some alterations on foreign names. Thus, Sennacherib is in the Sep. Σενναχηριμ; and Habakkuk, for a like reason, is Αμβακουμ. On how many of the Heb. names of the O. T. is a much greater change made in the N. in regard to which we find no different reading in the MSS.? I suppose, however, that the reason of the preference given by our translators, was not because the sound was more conformable to the Oriental word, a thing of no consequence to us, but because, through the universal use of Vul. before the Reformation, men were accustomed to the one name, and strangers to the other. The word Beelzebub means *the Lord of flies*. It is thought to be the name of some Syrian idol, but whether given by the worshippers themselves, or, as was not unusual, by the Jews in contempt, is to us matter only of conjecture.

26. *Therefore, fear them not.* Μη ουν φοβηθητε αυτους. Dr. Symonds asks (p. 74) "Could our Saviour mean, that the reason why his apostles had no just grounds of fear, was because they were sure to meet with barbarous treatment?" I answer, 'No; but because they could meet with no treatment, however bad, which he had not borne before, and which they had not been warned, and should therefore be prepared, to expect. This meaning results more naturally from the scope of the place, than that given by him.'

27. *From the house-tops.* Their houses were all flat-roofed.

29. *A penny.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

31. *Ye are much more valuable than sparrows,* πολλων στρουθιων διαφερετε υμεις. E. T. *Ye are of more value than many sparrows.* One MS. and the Com. read πολλω for πολλων

This, I acknowledge, is of no weight. The same sense is conveyed either way. Cas. *Longè passeribus antecellitis vos.* This expression is more conformable to modern idioms.

34. *I came not to bring peace, but a sword.* } An energetic
 35. *I am come to make dissension.* } mode of ex-
 pressing the certainty of a foreseen consequence of any measure, by representing it as the purpose for which the measure was adopted. This idiom is familiar to the Orientals, and not unfrequent in other authors, especially poets and orators.

38. *He who will not take his cross and follow me.* Every one condemned by the Romans to crucifixion, was compelled to carry the cross on which he was to be suspended, to the place of execution. In this manner our Lord himself was treated. Properly, it was not the whole cross that was carried by the convict, But the cross-beam. The whole was more than suited the natural strength of a man to carry. The perpendicular part probably remained in the ground; the tranverse beam (here called *the cross*) was added, when there was an execution. As this was not a Jewish but a Roman punishment, the mention of it on this occasion may justly be looked on as the first hint given by Jesus of the death he was to suffer. If it had been usual in the country to execute criminals in this manner, the expression might have been thought proverbial, for denoting to prepare for the worst.

39. *He who preserveth his life shall lose it.* There is in this sentence a kind of paronomasia, whereby the same word is used in different senses, in such a manner as to convey the sentiment with greater energy to the attentive. ‘He who, by making a sacrifice of his duty, preserves temporal life, shall lose eternal life; and contrariwise.’ The like trope our Lord employs in that expression, ch. viii. 22. *Let the dead bury their dead.* Let the spiritually dead bury the naturally dead. See also ch. xiii. 12. In the present instance, the trope has a beauty in the original, which we cannot give it in a version. The word *ψυχη* is equivocal, signifying both *life* and *soul*, and consequently is much better fitted for exhibiting with entire perspicuity, the two meanings, than the Eng. word *life*. The Syro-Chaldaic, which was the language then spoken in Palestine, had, in this respect, the same advantage with the Gr.

CHAPTER XI.

1. *Give warning.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 2, &c.

² *In the cities, εν ταις πολεσιν αυτων.* E. T. *In their cities.* It is not uncommon in the Oriental dialects, to employ a pronoun where the antecedent, to which it refers, is not expressed, but understood. In this way αυτων is here used; for it must refer to the Galileans, in whose country they then were. But as the pronoun is not necessary in Eng. and as in our ears it would appear to refer to disciples, and so might mislead, it is better omitted.

2. *Of the Messiah, του Χριστου.* A few MSS. and the Eth. version, read του Ιησου. It is not in itself improbable, that this is the true reading, though too weakly supported to authorize an alteration in the text. Ιησους, Κυριος, Θεος, and Χριστος, having been anciently almost always written by contraction, were more liable to be mistaken than other words. If, however, the common reading be just, it deserves to be remarked, that the word Χριστος is never, when alone, and with the article, used in the Gospels, as a proper name. It is the name of an office. The import of the expression must therefore be, ‘When John had heard that those works were performed by Jesus, which are characteristic of the Messiah, he sent.’ Diss. V. P. IV. § 6—9.

3. *He that cometh, ο ερχομενος.* E. T. *He that should come.* I thought it better to render this literally, because it is one of the titles by which the Messiah was distinguished. It answers in Gr. to the Heb. *הָבָא* *haba*, taken from Psal. cxviii. 26. where he is denominated, *He that cometh in the name of the Lord.* The beginning of a description is usually employed to suggest the whole. Indeed the whole is applied to him, ch. xxi. 9. Mr. xi. 9. L. xix. 38. J. xii. 13. and sometimes the abbreviation, as here, and in J. vi. 14. Heb. x. 37. ο ερχομενος seems to have been a title as much appropriated as ο Χριστος, and ο υιος του Δαβιδ.

5. *Good news is brought.* Diss. V. P. II.

6. *To whom I shall not prove a stumbling-block, ος εαν μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι.* Ch. v. 29. N.

7. *A reed shaken by the wind?* A proverbial expression; implying, 'It is surely not for any trifling matter that ye have gone thither.'

8. *Ανθρώπον εν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμενον—ὄτι τα μαλακα φοροῦντες*—It was observed (Diss. X. P. V. § 2.) that, when a particular species was denoted by an adjective added to the general name, the article, on occasion of repeating the name, is made to supply the place of the adjective; but here we have an example wherein, on rejecting the adjective, the substantive is supplied by prefixing the article *τα μαλακα* for *μαλακα ἱματια*. There is evidently, therefore, neither redundancy nor impropriety in using the article here, as some have vainly imagined. Either it or the repetition of the noun was necessary, in point of precision.

10. *Angel.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

12. *Invaded.* The comparison is here to a country invaded and conquered, or to a city besieged and taken by storm.

13. *Were your instructors, προεφητευσαν.* Ch. vii. 15. N.

15. *Whoever hath ears, &c.* Diss. II. P. III. § 5.

16. *In the market-place, εν αγοραις.* E. T. *In the markets.* But a great number of MSS. as well as the Vul. Go. and Sy. versions, have the word in the singular. The passage was also read thus by some of the ancient expositors. Moreover, the reading itself appears preferable.

17. *We have sung mournful songs, εθρηνησαμεν.* E. T. *We have mourned.* But mourning and lamenting are nearly synonymous. Hence that indistinctness in the E. T. which makes a reader at a loss to know what those children wanted of their companions. If it was to join them in mourning, it would have been more natural to retain the word, and say, *But ye have not mourned with us.* There are other reasons which render this supposition improbable. One is, the former member of the sentence shows, that it was one part which one of the sets of boys had to play, and another that was expected from the other. A second reason is, the similarity of the construction in the corresponding clauses, and the difference in the contrasted; *ἠυλησαμεν ὑμιν.* —*εθρηνησαμεν ὑμιν,* on one side, and *ουκ ωρχησασθε,*—*ουκ εχομισαθε* on the other. These things add a great degree of proba-

bility to the version I have given, after Er. and Cal. who say *lugubria cecinimus*; Dio. G. F. and L. Cl. who render the words in the same way, and Hey. who says, *sung mournful tunes*. But what puts it, with me, beyond a doubt, is, to find that the Seventy use *θρηνος* for *elegy*, or *song of lamentation*, and *θρηνειν* for *to sing such a song*. See 2 Sam. i. 17. For that the *lamentation* there following is a song or poem, is evident from its structure. See also the preamble in the Sep. to the book of Lamentations, where the song which immediately follows, composed alphabetically in the manner of some of the Psalms, is denominated *θρημος*, as indeed are all the other poems of that book. That the Jews used such melancholy music, sometimes instrumental, sometimes vocal, at funerals, and on other calamitous occasions, appears from several passages of Scripture. In Jeremiah's time, they had women whose occupation it was to sing them, Jer ix. 17. They are called in the Sep. *θρηνοῦσαι*. The word is weakly rendered in our version *the mourning women*; much better by Cas. *præficas*, women who, in melodious strains, gave vent to their lamentations. For those who know the power of music in conjunction with poetry will admit that these, by a wonderful charm, soothe, at the same time that they excite, the sorrow of the hearers. The words which follow in v. 18. render the justness of this interpretation still more evident. They are thus translated by Houbigant, *Ut cito edant in nobis cantus lugubres, ut lachrymas effundant oculi nostri, &c.* And in regard to the sense, not much differently by Cas. *Quæ nœniam de nobis editum propere veniant; profundantque oculi nostri lacrymas, &c.* In v. 20. which in our version is unintelligible (for how mere wailing, artificially taught, could gratify a person in real grief, is beyond comprehension), the difficulty is entirely removed by a right translation. Houbigant, *Instituite ad lamentum filias vestras, suam quæque sodalem ad cantus lugubres*. Cas. to the same purpose, *Filias vestras nœniam, et alias aliæ lamentationem docete*. In classical use also *θρηνειν* has often the same signification, and answers to *nœniam edere*. *Nœnia*, says Festus, *est carmen quod in funere, laudandi gratia, cantatur ad tibiam*.

19. *Wisdom is justified*. L. vii. 35 N.

20. *Began to reproach*, *ἤρξατο ονειδίζειν*. Mr. v. 17. N.

21. *Wo unto thee Chorazin.* L. vi. 24. N.

² *In sackcloth and ashes*; that is, 'the deepest contrition and sorrow.' *Sackcloth and ashes* were the outward signs of penitence in those days.

23. *Which hast been exalted to heaven,* ἡ ἕως του ουρανου ὑψωθηση. Vul. *Numquid usque in cælum exaltaberis?* The Cop. and the Eth. versions read in the same manner. In conformity to these, we find in a very few Gr. MSS. μη ἕως του ουρανου ὑψωθηση.

² *Hades.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 2, &c.

25. *I adore thee,* εξομολογομαι σοι. E. T. *I thank thee.* The word sometimes denotes, *to confess sins*, sometimes *to acknowledge favours*, and sometimes also *to adore or celebrate*. It is in the last of these senses I understand the word here. The nature of the sentiment makes this probable. But the reason assigned, v. 26. removes all doubt, *Yes, Father, because such is thy pleasure.* 'Every thing in which I discover thy will, I receive, not with acquiescence barely, but with veneration.'

² *Having hidden these things,—thou hast revealed them,* απεκρυψας ταυτα,—και απεκαλυψας αυτα. E. T. *Thou hast hid these things,—and hast revealed them.* We have the same idiom, Rom. vi. 17. *God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed*; the thanks are not given for their having been formerly the servants of sin, but for their being then obedient, Is. xii. 1. rendered literally from the Heb. is, *Lord, I will praise thee, because thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away.* In interpreting this, our translators have not been so scrupulous, but have rendered the middle clause, *though thou wast angry with me.* I know not why they have not followed the same method here. *Having hidden* implies barely, *not having revealed*, Mr. iii. 4. N.

³ *From sages and the learned,* απο σοφων και συνετων. E. T. *From the wise and prudent.* Σοφος, as used by the Evangelists, must be understood as equivalent to the Heb. חָכָם *hacham*, which, from signifying *wise* in the proper sense, came, after the establishment of academies in the country, often to denote those who had the superintendency of these seminaries, or a principal part in teaching. It seems also to have been used almost synonymously with *scribe*; so that in every view it suggests rather the

literary honours a man has attained, than the *wisdom* of which he is possessed. *Συνετος* answers to the Heb. word נָבֹן *nabon* which is more properly *intelligent* or *learned* than *prudent*; and both refer more to the knowledge acquired by study and application, than to what arises from experience and a good understanding. Accordingly they are here contrasted not with *μωροις*, *fools*, but with *νηπιους*, *babes*, persons illiterate, whose minds had not been cultivated in the schools of the rabbies.

29. *Be taught by me, μαθετε απ' εμου.* E. T. *Learn of me.* The phrase in Eng. is commonly understood to signify, *Follow my example.* But this does not express the full import, which is, *Be my disciples, be taught by me,* and is explanatory of the first order, *Take my yoke upon you.* See J. vi. 45. where *being taught of God,* and *learning of the Father,* are used as synonymous.

² *Condescending, ταπεινος τη καρδια.* E. T. *Lowly in heart.* I think, with Elsner, that our Lord's direct aim in this address is not to recommend these virtues in him to the imitation of the people, but himself to their choice as a teacher. The whole is to be explained therefore as having a view to this end. 'Be instructed by me, whom ye will find a meek and condescending teacher, not rough, haughty, and impatient, but one who can bear with the infirmities of the weak; and who, more desirous to edify others than to please himself, will not disdain to adapt his lessons to the capacities of the learners.'

CHAPTER XII.

1. *Began to pluck, ηρξαντο τιλλειν.* Mr. v. 17. N.

2. *What it is not lawful.* Plucking the ears of corn they considered as a species of reaping, and consequently as servile work, and not to be done on the sabbath.

4. *The tabernacle, τον οικον.* E. T. *The house.* The temple, which is oftenest in Scripture called *the house of God*, was not then built. And if the house of the high priest be here denominated *God's house*, as some learned men have supposed, the application is, I suspect, without example. I think, therefore, it is rather to be understood of the tabernacle formerly used, including the sacred pavilion, or sanctuary, and the court. These, before the building of the temple, we find commonly denominat-

ed the house of God. Further, that it was not into the holy place that David went, appears from this circumstance, the loaves of which he partook had been that day removed from before the Lord, and new bread had been put in their room, 1 Sam. xxi. 6. For the sake of perspicuity therefore, and because we do not apply the word *house* to such a portable habitation, I have thought it better to use some general name, as *tabernacle* or *mansion*, for under either of these terms the court or inclosure may be also comprehended.

3. *The loaves of the presence, τους αρτους της προθεβως.* E. T. *The shew-bread.* The Heb. expression, rendered literally, is *the loaves of the face, or of the presence.* This I thought it better to restore, than to continue in using a term which conveys an improper notion of the thing. Purver, whose version I have not seen, uses, as I am informed, the same expression.

5. *Violate the rest to be observed on sabbaths, τους σαββατιν το σαββατον βεηηλουσι.* E. T. *On the sabbath days profane the sabbath.* This looks oddly, as though the sabbath could be profaned on any other day. Let it be observed, that the Heb. word for *Sabbath* signifies also *rest*, and is used in both senses in this verse. The Evangelist, or rather his translator into Greek, though he retained the original word, has, to hint a difference in the meaning, made an alteration on it, when introduced the second time. Thus he uses *σαββασι*, from *σαββας*, for the *day*; but *σαββατον* for the sabbatical rest. If it be asked, how the priests violate the sabbatical rest? the answer is obvious, by killing and preparing the sacrifices, as well as by other pieces of manual labour absolutely necessary in performing the religious service which God had established among them.

6. *Something greater, μειζων.* E. T. *A greater.* But very many MSS. and some ancient expositors read *μειζον*. This is also more conformable to the style in similar cases. See xi. 9. and in this ch. see the note on v. 41. and 42.

8. *Of the sabbath, και του σαββατου.* E. T. *Even of the sabbath.* The *και* is wanting here in a very great number of MSS. in some early editions, in the Sy. and Cop. versions. It seems not to have been read by several ancient writers, and is rejected by Mill and Wetstein, and other critics.

14. *To destroy him, όπως αυτον απολεσωσι.* E. T. *How they might destroy him.* Most modern translations, as well as the

Eng. have in this followed the Vul. which says, *Quomodo perderent eum*. Yet *ὅπως* is not commonly rendered *quomodo* but *ut*. There seems to be no MS. which has *πως*, else I should have suspected that this had been the reading in the copy used by the La. translator. It is true that *ὅπως* answers sometimes to *quomodo*, as well as to *ut*; but it is a good rule in translating, always to prefer the usual signification, unless it would imply something absurd, or at least unsuitable to the scope of the place. Neither of these is the case here. If there be any difference, the ordinary acceptation is the preferable one. This is the first time that mention is made of a design on our Saviour's life. It is natural to think that the historian would acquaint us of their concurring in the design, before he would speak of their consulting about the means. The explanations given by the Greek Fathers supply, in some respects, an ancient version, as they frequently give the sense of the original in other words. In this passage, Chr. renders *ὅπως* by *ἵνα ut*, not by *πως* or *ὅν τροπον quomodo*. Συμβουλευονται ἵνα ἀνελθῶν αὐτον.

16. *Enjoining them*. Mr. ix. 25. N.

20. *A dimly burning taper he will not quench*, λινον τυφομενον οὐ σβέσει. E. T. *Smoking flax shall he not quench*. By an easy metonymy the material for the thing made, *flax*, is here used for the *wick* of a lamp or taper, and that by a synecdoche, for the *lamp*, or *taper* itself, which, when near going out, yields more smoke than light. The Sy. Ara. and Per. render it *lamp*, Dio. says, *lucignuolo*. See Lowth's translation of Isaiah, xlii. 3.

23. *Is this the son of David?* μητι οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος Δαβιδ; E. T. *Is not this the son of David?* Vul. and Ar. *Numquid hic est filius David?* With this agree in sense, Er. Zu. Cal. Pisc. and Cas. only using *num*, not *numquid*. Be. alone says, *Nonne iste est filius ille Davidis?* And in this he has been followed by the Eng. and some other Protestant translators. The Sy. and most of the ancient versions agree with the Vul. Sc. observes that *μητι* is not used by Mt. to interrogate negatively. He might have added, nor by any writer of the N. T. *Nonne* does not answer to *μητι*; but *num*, or *numquid*, in Eng. *whether*. Only let it be observed, that *whether* with us would often be superfluous, when *μητι* in Gr. and

num in La. would be necessary for distinguishing a question from an affirmation. See. ch. vii. 16. Mr. iv. 21. xiv. 19. L. vi. 39. J. vii. 31. viii. 22. xviii. 35. xxi. 5 2 Cor. xii. 18. In any one of these places, to render it by a negative would pervert the sense. These are all the places wherein it occurs in this form. The only other passage in the N. T. where it is found is 1 Cor. vi. 3. There it has an additional particle, and is not *μητι* but *μητιγχε*, used for stating a comparison, and rendered *how much more*? This therefore cannot be called an exception. I own, at the same time, that to say, *Is this*, or *Is not this*, in a case like the present, makes little change in the sense. Both express doubtfulness, but with this difference, that the former seems to imply that *disbelief*, the latter that *belief*, preponderates. J. iv. 29. N.

24. *This man, οὗτος*. E. T. *This fellow*. Why did not our translators say in the preceding verse, *Is not this fellow the Son of David*? The pronoun is the same in both. Our idiom, in many cases, will not permit us to use the demonstrative, without adding a noun. But as the Gr. term does not imply, a translator is not entitled to add, any thing contemptuous. By such freedoms, one of the greatest beauties of these divine writers has been considerably injured. Diss. III. § 23.

29. *The strong one's house*. L. xi. 21. N.

31. *Detraction, βλασφημία*. Vul. *Blasphemia*. E. T. *Blasphemy*. Cas. *Maledictum*. Er. Zu. Pisc. and Cal. *Convitium*. The Gr. word denotes injurious expressions, or *detraction* in the largest acceptation, whether against God or man. When God is the object, it is properly rendered *blasphemy*. It is evident, that in this passage both are included, as the different kinds are compared together, consequently the general term ought to be employed, which is applicable alike to both: whereas the term *blasphemy*, with us, is not used of any verbal injury that is not aimed directly against God. Diss. IX. P. II.

² *In meū is pardonable, αφεθησεται τοις ανθρωποις*. E. T. *Shall be forgiven unto men*. As the Heb. has no subjunctive or potential mood, the future tense is frequently made use of, for supplying this defect. This idiom is common in the Sep. and has been thence adopted into the N. T. It is evidently our Lord's

meaning here, not that every such sin shall actually be pardoned, but that it is, in the divine economy, capable of being pardoned, or is *pardonable*. The words in connection sufficiently secure this term from being interpreted *venial*, as it sometimes denotes. The words *remissible* and *irremissible*, would have been less equivocal, but are rather technical terms, than words in common use.

³ *Against the spirit.* Diss. IX. P. II. § 17.

32. *In the present state,—in the future,* εν τω τω αιωνι,—εν τω μελλοντι. E. T. *In this world,—in the world to come.* The word *state* seems to suit better here than either *age*, which some prefer, or *world*, as in the common version. Admit, though by no means certain, that by the two αιωνες are here meant the *Jewish* dispensation and the *Christian*. These we cannot in Eng. call *ages*; as little can we name them *worlds*. The latter implies too much, and the former too little. But they are frequently and properly called *states*. And as there is an ambiguity in the original (for the first clause may mean the present life, and the second the life that follows), the Eng. word *state* is clearly susceptible of this interpretation likewise. And though I consider it as a scrupulosity bordering on superstition, to preserve in a version every ambiguous phrase that may be found in the original, where the scope of the passage, or the words in construction, sufficiently ascertain the sense; yet where there is real ground to doubt about the meaning, one does not act the part of a faithful translator, who does not endeavour to give the sentiment in the same latitude to his readers in which the author gave it to him. This may not always be possible; but, where it is possible, it should be done. Diss. XII. P. I. § 23.

35. *Out of his good treasure,* εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας. E. T. *Out of the good treasure of the heart.* But the words της καρδιας are wanting in so many MSS. even those of the greatest note, ancient versions, and commentators, that they cannot be regarded as authentic. Pearce, through I know not what inadvertency, has said that the word here should be rendered *treasury*. *The treasury* is the place where treasure is deposited, which may be a very noble edifice, though all the treasure it contains be good for nothing. Now a man's producing good things is surely an evidence of the goodness, not of his *store-house*, but of his *stores*.

36. *Pernicious word*, ρημα αργον. E. T. *Idle word*. Cas. *Malum verbum*. The epithet αργος, when applied to words, has been shown by several τὸ denote *pernicious, false, calumnious*. To this sense the context naturally leads. In the primitive meaning, *idle* it is applicable only to persons. When it is applied to things, as the words or actions of men, it is understood to denote such in quality as spring from habitual idleness. And in this class the Jews were wont to rank almost all the vices of the tongue, particularly *lying* and *defamation*. See 1 Tim. v. 13. Consider also the import of the phrase γαστρερε, αργαι, in the character given of the Cretans, Tit. i. 12. This, if we render the word αργος as in the text, is *idle bellies*, which, if we were to interpret it by our idiom, ought to denote *abstemiousness*, as in the abstemious the *belly* may be said to be comparatively *idle* or unemployed. Yet the meaning is certainly the reverse. The author's idea is rather *bellies of the idle*, those who spend their time merely in pampering themselves. Thus *cruel hands* are the hands of *cruel persons*, an *envious eye* is the eye of a man or woman actuated by envy, a *contemptuous look* the look of one who cannot conceal his contempt. From this rule of interpretation, in such cases, I do not know a single exception. And by this rule interpreted ρηματα αργα is such conversation as abounds most with habitual idlers. It was not uncommon with the Jewish doctors, to make *verba otii* stand as a contrast to *verba veritatis*, thus employing it as a euphemism for falsehood and lies. I am far from intending, by this remark, to signify that what we commonly call *idle*, that is vain and unedifying *words*, are not sinful, and consequently to be brought into judgment. If these be not comprehended in the ρηματα αργα of this passage, they may be included in the μωρολογια, *foolish talking*, mentioned by the Apostle, Eph. v. 4.

37. *Or, και*. As both clauses in this verse cannot be applied to the same person, this is one of the cases wherein the copulative is properly rendered *or*.

38. *A sign* ; that is, ' a miracle in proof of thy mission.'

39. *Adulterous*, μοιχαλις. Vul. *Adultera*. " This may be understood," says Si. " suitably to the symbolical phraseology of ancient prophecy, as denoting *infidel, apostate*." He has accordingly, in his translation, rendered it *infidèle*. I cannot help

observing that, if this had been the rendering in the version of P. R. which here keeps the beaten road, and says *adultere*, we should have been told by that critic, that the term employed by those interpreters was not a translation, but a comment, which they ought to have reserved for the margin. And I must acknowledge, that he would have had, in this place, more scope for the distinction, than, in many places, wherein he urges it. For it is very far from being evident that our Saviour here adopts the allegorical style of the prophets. Besides, in their style, it is *idolatry*, and not *infidelity*, which in Jews is called *adultery*. And with *idolatry* we do not find them charged in the N. T.

40. *Of the great fish, του κητους.* E. T. *The whale's.* But *κητος* is not a *whale*, it is a general name for any huge fish, or *sea monster*. It was the word used by the *Seventy*, properly enough, for rendering what was simply called, in *Jonah*, a *great fish*.

41. *They were warned by Jonah.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 2.

41, 42. *Something greater, πλειον.* E. T. *A greater.* There is a modesty and a delicacy in the use made of the neuter gender in these verses, which a translator ought not to overlook. Our Lord chooses, on this occasion, rather to insinuate, than to affirm, the dignity of his character; and to afford matter of reflection to the attentive amongst his disciples, without furnishing his declared enemies with a handle for contradiction.

44. *Furnished, κεκοσμημενην.* E. T. *Garnished.* *Κοσμεω* signifies *I adorn*, commonly, when applied to a person, *with apparel*, and to a house, *with furniture*. This in old Eng. has probably been the meaning of the word *to garnish*, agreeably to the import of its Fr. etymon, *garnir*.

46. *Brothers.* It is almost too well known to need being mentioned, that in the Heb. idiom near relations, such as nephews and cousins, are often styled *brothers*. The O. T. abounds with examples.

CHAPTER XIII.

3. *In parables, εν παραβολαις.* The word *παραβολη*, as used by the Evangelists, has all the extent of signification in which the Heb. מָשָׁל *mashal* is used in the O. T. It not only means what

we call *parable*, but also comparison of any kind, nay *proverb*, *prediction*, or any thing figuratively or poetically expressed, sometimes any moral instruction, as L. xiv. 7. Our translators have not always rendered it *parable*. They call it *comparison*, Mr. iv. 30. *proverb*, L. iv. 23. *figure*, Heb. ix. 9. xi. 19. They have, however, retained the word *parable* in several places, where they had as good reason to change it as in those now mentioned. A *parable*, in the ordinary acceptation of the word in Eng. is a species of comparison. It differs from an *example*, in which there is properly no similitude, but an instance in kind. Of this sort is the story of the Pharisee and the Publican, who went up to the temple to pray; of the rich man and Lazarus, and of the compassionate Samaritan; also that of the fool, who, when his stores were increased, flattered himself that he had a security of enjoyment for many years. Nor is it every sort of comparison. What is taken entirely from still life we should hardly call a parable. Such is the comparison of the kingdom to a grain of mustard seed, and to leaven. Rational and active life seems always to enter into the notion. Further, the action must be feasible, or at least possible. Jotham's fable of the trees choosing a king, is properly an *apologue*; because, literally understood, the thing is impossible. There is also a difference between *parable* and *allegory*. In *allegory* (which is no other than a lesson delivered in metaphor) every one of the principal words has, through the whole, two meanings, the literal and the figurative. Whatever is advanced should be pertinent, understood either way. The allegory is always imperfect where this does not hold. It is not so in parable, where the scope is chiefly regarded, and not the words taken severally. That there be a resemblance in the principal incidents is all that is required. Smaller matters are considered only as a sort of drapery. Thus, in the parable of *the prodigal*, all the characters and chief incidents are significant, and can scarcely be misunderstood by an attentive reader; but to attempt to assign a separate meaning to *the best robe*, and *the ring*, and *the shoes*, and *the fatted calf*, and *the music*, and *the dancing*, betrays great want of judgment, as well as puerility of fancy. In those instructions of our Lord, promiscuously termed *parables*, there are specimens of all the different kinds above mentioned, *apologue* alone excepted. Let it be observed, that it matters not whether the relation itself be true

history or fiction. The truth of the parable lies in the justness of the application.

4. *The sower*, ὁ σπειρων. E. T. *A sower*. The article here is, in my opinion, not without design, as it suggests that the application is eminently to one individual.

5. *Rocky ground*, τα πετρωδη. E. T. *Stony places*. But this does not express the sense. There may be many loose stones, from which the place would properly be denominated *stony*, where the soil is both rich and deep. What is meant here is evidently continued rock, with a very thin cover of earth.

9. *Whoever hath ears*. Diss. II. P. III. § 5.

11. *The secrets*, τα μυστηρια. E. T. *The mysteries*. That the common signification of *μυστηρια* is, as rendered by Cas. *arcana*, there can be no doubt. Diss. IX. P. I. The moral truths here alluded to, and displayed in the explanation of the parable, are as far from being mysteries, in the common acceptation, *doctrines incomprehensible*, as any thing in the world can be.

12. *To him that hath*. Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

14. *Is fulfilled*, αναπληρουται. I am not positive that the compound verb *αναπληρωω* means more than the simple *πληρωω*, which, for a reason assigned above (note on ch. i. 22.), I commonly translate *verify*. But as the word here is particular, and not used in any other passage of the Gospels, and as *ανα* in composition is sometimes what grammarians call intensive, I have imitated the Evangelist in changing the word. Though it is evident, from the passage in Isaiah, that the character quoted was that of the people in the prophet's time; we have reason to think that there must have been in the description a special view to the age of the Messiah, which the obduracy of Isaiah's contemporaries was exhibited chiefly to prefigure; for, of all the passages in the O. T. relating to these events, this is that which is the oftenest quoted in the New.

15. *Understanding*, καρδια. Diss. IV. § 23.

16. *Blessed*, μακαριοι. Though I commonly render this word *happy*, to distinguish it from *ευλογητος*, I do not think the application of the word *happy* in this verse would suit the Eng. idiom.

19. *Mindeth it not, μη συνιεντος.* E. T. *Understandeth it not.* Be. and Pisc. *Non attendit.* Beau. *Ne la goute point.* P. R. and Sa. *N'y fait point d'attention.* That the verb *συνιημι* frequently means, both in the Sep. and in the N. T. *to mind, to regard, to attend to,* is unquestionable. See Ps. xli. 1. cvi. 7. Prov. xxi. 12. Rom. iii. 11. In two of these passages the common translation has *considereth*; and though the verb *understand* is used in the other two, the context makes it manifest, that the meaning is the same. In the passage under review, An. Hey. Wes. use the verb *consider*; Wor. and Wa. *regard.* This remark affects also v. 13.

19, &c. *That which fell, &c. ὁ σπαραεις.* E. T. *He which received seed.* I agree with Ham. in thinking that ὁ σπορος, *the seed,* a word in common use both in the Sep. and in the N. T. is here understood. It is this which alone can be said to be sown, and not the persons who are figured by the different soils. In the other way of explaining it, there is such a jumble of the literal sense and of the figurative, as presents no image to the mind, and is unexampled in holy writ.

^a *Εἶτι,* in such cases, is properly rendered *denotes.*

21. *He relapseth, σκανδαλιζεται.* E. T. *He is offended.* For the general import of the Gr. word, see the note on ch. v. 29. The precise meaning in this passage is plainly indicated by the connexion. Notice is taken of a temporary convert made by the word, whom persecution causes to relapse into his former state. Cas. renders it *desciscit.* This is agreeable to the sense, and an exact version of the word *απιστανται* used in the parallel place, L. viii. 13.

24. *May be compared to a field, in which the proprietor had sown good grain, ὁμοιωθη ανθρωπω σπειροντι καλον σπερμα εν τω αγρω αυτου.* It is admitted on all sides that, in translating these similitudes, the words ought not to be traced with rigour. The meaning is sufficiently evident.

25. *Darnel, ξιζανια.* E. T. *Tares.* Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cal. Be. Pisc. *Zizania.* Cas. (because *zizanium* is not Lat.) has chosen to employ a general appellation, and say, *Malas herbas.* It appears from the parable itself, 1st, That this weed was not only hurtful to the corn, but otherwise of no value, and therefore to be severed and burnt. 2dly, That it resembled corn, especially wheat, since it was

only when the wheat was putting forth the ear that these weeds were discovered. Now neither of these characters will suit *the tare*, which is excellent food for cattle, and sometimes cultivated for their use ; and which, being a species of vetch, is distinguished from corn from the moment it appears above ground. Lightfoot observes that the Talmudic name answering to *ξιζανιον* is זִיזִי *zonin*, which is probably formed from the Gr. and quotes this saying, *Triticum et zonin non sunt semina heterogenea*. Chr. remarks to the same purpose, *ουκ αλλο τι σπερμα, αλλα ξιζανια καλει, ο και κατα την ομιν, εοικε πως τω σιτω*, “ he mentions no other weed but *zizania*, which, in its appearance, bears a resemblance to wheat.” It may be remarked by the way, that Chr. speaks of it as a plant at that time known to every body. Now, as it cannot be *the tare* that is meant, it is highly probable that it is the *darnel*, in La. *lolium*, namely, that species called by botanists *temulentum*, which grows among corn, not the *lolium perenne*, commonly called *ray*, and corruptly *rye-grass*, which grows in meadows. For, 1st, this appears to have been the La. word by which the Gr. was wont to be interpreted. 2dly, It agrees to the characters above mentioned. It is a noxious weed ; for when the seeds happen to be mingled and ground with the corn, the bread made of this mixture always occasions sickness and giddiness in those who eat it ; and the straw has the same effect upon the cattle : it is from this quality, and the appearance of drunkenness which it produces, that it is termed *yvraie* in Fr. and has the specific name *temulentum* given it by botanists. And probably for the same reason it is called by Virgil, *infelix lolium*. It has also a resemblance to wheat sufficient to justify all that relates to this in the parable, or in the above quotations. By that saying, *non sunt semina heterogenea*, we are not to understand, with Lightfoot, that they are of the same genus, but that they are of the same class or tribe. Both are comprehended in the *gramina* ; nay more, both terminate in a bearded spike, having the grains in two opposite rows. All the Fr. translations I have seen render it *yvraie*. Dio. *zizzanie*, which in the Vocabolario della Crusca, is explained by the La. *lolium*. Those who render it *cockle* are as far from the truth as the common version. The only Eng. translation in which I have found the word *darnel* is Mr. Wesley’s.

32. *The smallest of all seeds* ; that is, of all those seeds with which the people of Judea were then acquainted. Our Lord's words are to be interpreted by popular use. And we learn from this Gospel, xvii. 20. that *like a grain of mustard seed* was become proverbial for expressing a very small quantity.

* *Becometh a tree.* That there was a species of the *sinapi*, or at least what the Orientals comprehended under that name, which rose to the size of a tree, appears from some quotations brought by Lightfoot and Buxtorf, from the writings of the Rabbies, men who will not be suspected of partiality, when their testimony happens to favour the writers of the N. T.

33. *Measures, σατα.* The word denotes a particular measure ; but as we have none corresponding to it, and as nothing seems to depend on the quantity, I have, after our translators, used the general name, ch. v. 15. N.

35. *Things whereof all antiquity hath been silent, κερυμμενα απο καταβολης κοσμου.* E. T. *Things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.* The Evangelist has not followed literally either the Heb. $\text{סֵתֵר מִי מִיְהוּדָה}$, or the version of the Seventy, *προβληματα απ' αρχης*, but has faithfully given the meaning. I have endeavoured to imitate him in this, attaching myself more to the sense than to the letter. This is in a more especial manner allowable in translating quotations from a poem. Diss. XII. P. I. § 10. As to the phrase *καταβολη κοσμου*, see ch. xxv. 34. N.

39. *Conclusion of this state, συντελεια του αιωνος.* E. T. *The end of the world ; αιων, state,* ch. xii. 32. N. I commonly render *τελος end, συντελεια conclusion.*

41. *All seducers, παντα σκανδαλα.* This term commonly denotes the actions or things which ensnare or seduce ; here it is the persons, being joined with *τους ποιουντας*, and is therefore rendered seducers.

48. *The useless, τα σαπρα,* ch. vii. 17. N.

52. *New things and old καινα και παλαια.* E. T. *Things new and old.* There is no ambiguity in the Gr. Each of the adjectives, by its gender and number, virtually expresses its own substantive. In the E. T. both adjectives *new* and *old* are construed with the same substantive *things*, though they do not relate to the same sub-

ject ; for *the new things* are certainly different from *the old*. Either therefore, the word *things* ought to be repeated, and it should be *things new*, and *things old* ; or the arrangement should be altered. If both adjectives immediately precede the noun or immediately follow, both are regarded as belonging to the same substantive, and ought to relate to the same subject. If the noun be placed after one of the adjectives, and before the other, it will be understood as belonging only to the first, and suggesting the repetition of the term after the second. In the present case, common sense secures us against mistake : but, if we do not avoid improprieties in plain cases, we have no security for escaping them, where they may perplex and mislead. See Phil. of Rhet. B. II. ch. vi. § II. P. II.

54. *Synagogue*. One MS. with the Vul. Sy. and Arm. versions reads *synagogues*.

55. *The carpenter's son*, ὁ τοῦ τεκτονοῦ υἱός. Some affirm that all the evidence we have that Joseph was a *carpenter* is from tradition ; that the word used in the Gospels means *artificer* in general, at least, one who works in wood, stone, or metal. I admit that the Gr. *τεκτων* answers nearly to the Lat. *faber*, which, according to the word accompanying it, as *lignarius*, *ferrarius*, *ærarius*, *eboris*, or *marmoris*, expresses different occupations. Thus, we have also, *τεκτων ξυλων*, *σιδηρου*, *χαλκου*, *λιθων*, for so many sorts of artificers. But there is no inconsistency in saying also, that when the word is used alone, it commonly denotes one of these occupations only, and not any of them indifferently. That this is actually the case with this word, in the usage of the sacred writers ; and that, when it is by itself, it implies *a carpenter*, may be proved by the following, amongst other passages in the Sep. 2 Ki. xxii. 6. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12. xxxiv. 11. Ezr. iii. 7. Is. xli. 7. Zech. i. 20. On the other hand, I have not found a single passage where it is employed in the same manner, to denote a man of a different occupation. There is something analogous, though the words are not equivalent, in the use of the word *smith* with us. It is employed in composition to denote almost every artificer in metal, the species being ascertained by the word compounded with it. Hence we have *goldsmith*, *silversmith*, *coppersmith*, *locksmith*, *gunsmith*, *blacksmith*. But if we use the word *smith*, simply, and without any thing connected to confine its signification, we always mean *blacksmith*.

55, 56. *Do not his brothers, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas, and all his sisters live amongst us?* *οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβος, καὶ Ἰωσῆς, καὶ Σιμων, καὶ Ἰουδας καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ παθαὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἶδν.* Upon reflection, it appears the more natural way of translating these two clauses, to make but one question of both.

² *Πρὸς ἡμᾶς.* Mr. vi. 3. N.

57. *They were scandalized at him,* *ἐσκανδαλιζόντο ἐν αὐτῷ.* E. T. *They were offended in him.* This is one of the few instances in which the Eng. verb *scandalize*, expresses better the sense of the Gr. than any other in the language. To be *scandalized*, is to be offended on account of something supposed criminal or irreligious. This was the case here. Their knowledge of the meanness of our Lord's birth and education, made them consider him as guilty of an impious usurpation, in assuming the character of a Prophet, much more in aspiring to the title of the Messiah. The verb *to be offended*, does not reach the sense, and *to be offended in*, can hardly be said to express any thing, because not in the idiom of the tongue. Ch. v. 29. N.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Tetrarch, Τετραρχης.* Properly, the governor of the fourth part of a country; commonly used as a title inferior to *king*, and denoting chief ruler. The person here spoken of was Antipas, a son of Herod the Great. The name *king* is sometimes given to tetrarchs. See verse 9.

3. *His brother.* Sons of the same father, Herod the Great, by different mothers.

² *Philip's.* The name is not in the Vul. nor in the Cam. MS. It is in the Sax.

4. *It is not lawful for thee to have her.* As it appears from Josephus (Antiq. L. xviii. c. 7.) that this action was perpetrated during the life of her husband, it was a complication of the crimes of incest and adultery. There was only one case wherein a man might lawfully marry his brother's widow, which was, when he died childless. But Herodias had a daughter by her husband.

6. *But when Herod's birth-day was kept,* *γενεθίων δε ἀγομενῶν του Ἡρώδου.* Some think, that by *γενεθία* is here meant the day of Herod's accession to his tetrarchy. The word may sometimes

be used with this latitude; but unless where there is positive evidence that it has that meaning, the safer way is to prefer the customary interpretation.

9. *The king was sorry, nevertheless, from a regard to his oath, &c.* In how dispassionate a manner, and with what uncommon candour does Mt. relate this most atrocious action! No exclamation! no exaggeration! no invective! There is no allowance, which even the friend of Herod would have urged in extenuation of his guilt, that this historian is not ready to make. *He was sorry, nevertheless, from a regard to his oath, and his guests*—The remark of Raphelius on the whole story is so pertinent, that I cannot avoid subjoining it: “Vide, quanta simplicitate rem narret, ne graviori quidem verbo factum indignissimum notans. Neque hæc aliter scribi oportuit. Ne quis igitur forsitan imperitior ista aspernetur, quasi crasso nimis filo, nulloque artificio, sint contexta: aliis formis alia ornamenta conveniunt. Hanc, quam Matthæus sermoni suo induit, natus maxime color, et nuda rerum expositio honestat.”

13. *By land, πεξη.* E. T. *On foot.* The Gr. word has unquestionably both significations. It means *on foot*, when opposed to *on horseback*; and *by land*, when contrasted with *by sea*.

15. *Towards the evening.* See verse 23. N.

19. *Blessed them, ευλογησε.* E. T. *He blessed.* With us, *to bless* is an active verb; and it may be asked, Whom, or what did he bless? The words in connexion lead us to apply it to the loaves. Thus, *He blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves.* Oriental use, however, would incline us to think that the meaning is, *blessed God*; that is, gave thanks to him. Thus, in the other miracle of the same kind, recorded in the next chapter, instead of ευλογησε, we have ευχαριστησας, *having given thanks.* See also Mr. viii. 6. J. vi. 11. The same thing takes place in the accounts given by the sacred writers of the last supper. What one calls ευλογησας another calls ευχαριστησας. This would make us suspect the terms to be synonymous. But as we find the word ευλογεω applied L. ix. 16. and 1 Cor. x. 16. to the things distributed, it is better here to give it the interpretation to which the construction evidently points. The Jews have, in their rituals, a prayer used on such occasions, which they call ברכה *brahach*,

that is, the *blessing* or *benediction*. It is probable, that no more was meant by either verb than that he said such a prayer.

23. *It was late*. It may appear strange to an ordinary reader, that the same phrase, *ωπιας γενομενης*, is used, v. 15. to express the time when his disciples applied to him to dismiss the multitude, which was immediately before he fed them miraculously in the wilderness, and now after they had eaten and were dismissed, after the disciples were embarked, and had sailed half way over the sea of Galilee; and after he himself had retired to a mountain, and been occupied in prayer, the time is represented by the same phrase, *ωπιας γενομενης*. Let it be observed, for the sake of removing this difficulty, that the Jews spoke of two evenings: the first was considered as commencing from *the ninth hour*; that is, in our reckoning *three o'clock afternoon*; the second from *the twelfth hour*, or *sunset*. This appears from several passages of the O. T. In the institution of the passover, for instance, the people are commanded (Ex. xii. 6.) to kill the lamb *in the evening*. The marginal reading, which is the literal version of the Heb. is *between the two evenings*; that is, between three and six o'clock afternoon. What is said, therefore, v. 15. denotes no more, than that it was about three; what is said here implies, that it was after sun-set. The attendant circumstances remove all ambiguity from the words. But as it was impossible to make this peculiarity in the idiom perspicuous in a translation, I have given, in the version, the import which the phrase has in the different places, and have added this explanation for the sake of the unlearned. Mr. xv. 42. N.

33. *A son of God*, *υιος θεου*. E. T. *The son of God*. In regard to the title *ο υιος του θεου*, which alone expresses definitely *the Son of God*, Mt. mentions it only once as given, by any man, to our Lord, before his resurrection; and that was in the memorable confession made by Peter, ch. xvi. 16. which gave occasion to a remarkable declaration and promise. It may be asked, Did not those mariners mean that our Lord was the Messiah, and, by consequence, more eminently than any other, *the Son of God*? It is not certain that this declaration implies their belief in him as the Messiah: they might intend only to say that he was a Prophet; for such are denominated sons of God: but supposing they meant the Messiah, we know too well the notions which at that time

obtained universally concerning the Messiah, as a temporal deliverer, to conclude that they annexed to the appellation, *Son of God*, aught of that peculiarity of character which Christians now do, on the best authority. If instead of *God*, we should say, *a God*, the version would be still more literal, and perhaps more just. Some think that those mariners were Pagans, of whom there was a great mixture in some places on the coasts of this lake. If they were, *the Son of a God* would be the proper expression of their meaning. Ch. xxvii. 54. N.

35. *That country*, την περιχωρον εκεινην. E. T. *That country round about*. Mr. i. 28. N.

CHAPTER XV.

1. *Of Jerusalem*, απο Ιερουσαλυμων. That απο, before the name of a place, often denotes simply *of*, or *belonging to*, and not *from*, that place, many proofs might be brought from classical writers, as well as from sacred. Of the latter sort, the three examples following shall suffice: J. xi. 1. Acts xvii. 13. Heb. xiii. 24.

4. *Revileth*, ζακολογων. E. T. *Curseth*. I am astonished that modern translators have so generally rendered the Gr. ζακολογειν, by the word *to curse*, or some equivalent term. *To curse*, that is, to pray imprecations, is always expressed in the N. T. by καταρασθαι, αναθεματιζειν, καταναθεματιζειν *a curse*, by καταρα, αναθεμα, καταναθεμα; *cursed*, by κατηραμενος and επικαταρατος. The proper import of the word ζακολογειν is *to give abusive language*, to revile, to calumniate. It may, indeed, be said justly, that *cursing*, as one species of abusive words, is also included. But it is very improper to confine a term of so extensive signification to this single particular. Nay more, the application, in the present instance, is evidently to reproachful words quite different from cursing. Our Lord, by quoting both the commandment and the denunciation against the opposite crime, has shown, that the Pharisees not only allowed the omission, but, in a certain case, prohibited the observance of the duty; nay, which is worse, made no account of the commission of a crime which, by the law, had been pronounced capital. First, They had devised for children an easy method of eluding the obligation to

maintain their indigent parents, which is implied in *the honour* enjoined by the precept ; and, secondly, They made light of a man's treating his parent abusively, when they permitted him to say with impunity, "I devote whatever of mine shall profit thee ;" which, though not properly cursing his parent, was threatening him, and venting an implicit imprecation against himself, that he might be held guilty of perjury and sacrilege, if ever he contributed to his support. This I take to be the *κακολογια*, the abuse, of which our Lord signifies, that, instead of being the means of releasing them from the observance of an express command of God, was itself a crime of the most heinous nature. The Heb. verb is *ללך kalal*, the signification of which is equally extensive with that of the Gr. and it has, in some places of the O. T. been as improperly rendered as the Gr. is in the N. In none, indeed, more remarkably than in Nehem. xiii. 25. where the inspired writer says only, *I reproached them*, our interpreters have, not very decently, made him say, *I cursed them*. The Heb. *kalal*, and the Gr. *cacologeō*, are both rightly rendered, by all the Lat. translators, *maledico*, a term exactly of the same import. But those Gr. words above quoted, which signify properly *to curse*, are rendered very differently by them all. For this purpose, they use *imprecor*, *execror*, *detestor*, *devoveo*, *diris ago*, and *anathematizo*. The verb *καταραμαι*, is only once in the Vul. translated *maledico* ; and into this I imagine the translator has been led, by an inclination to verbal antithesis, which has often occasioned a greater deviation from the sense. *Benedicite maledicentibus vobis*. The only Eng. versions which I have seen, which render *κακολογων revileth*, are Wes.'s Wor.'s and Wa.'s. Sa. after the version of P. R. has well expressed the sense in Fr. by a periphrasis, *qui aura outragé de paroles*.

5. *I devote*. Mr. vii. 11. N.

* *Honour by his assistance*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 15.

8. *This people address me with their mouth, and honour me with their lips*. *Εγγιζει μοι ὁ λαος οὗτος τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς χεῖλεσι με τιμα*. Vul. *Populus hic labiis me honorat*. There is nothing to answer to these words, *εγγιζει μοι τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καὶ* : the like defect is in the Sy. the Cop. the Sax. the Eth. and the Arm. versions. The words are also wanting in three MSS. The passage in the prophecy quoted, is agreeable to the common reading.

9. *Institutions merely human, ενταλματα ανθρωπων.* E. T. *The commandments of men.* The word *ενταλμα* occurs but thrice in the N. T. namely here, in the parallel place, Mr. vii. 7. and in Col. ii. 22. In all these places it is joined with *ανθρωπων*; as it is also in the passage of the Sep. here quoted. Moreover, in all these places, the *ενταλματα* are mentioned with evident disapprobation, and contrasted, by implication, with the precepts of God, which in the N. T. are never denominated *ενταλματα*, but *εντολαι*. For these reasons, I thought it more suitable to the original, to distinguish them in the version.

12. *Scandalized.* Ch. xiii. 57. N.

15. *Saying, παραβολην.* E. T. *Parable.* What Peter wanted to be explained, as the following words show, was that sentence, maxim, or proverb, which we have in v. 11. *It is not what goeth into the mouth*—This, on no principle, could be rendered *parable*, except that of Ar. of always translating the same word by the same word; a principle which our interpreters have not often followed, in regard to this or any other term. Ch. xiii. 3. N.

17. *The sink.* Mr. vii. 19. N.

26. *To the dogs, τοις κυναριοις.* Our Lord, in this expression, did but adopt the common style of his countrymen the Jews, in relation to the Gentiles, to whom this woman belonged; and he did this, evidently with a view to make the reflection, in v. 28. strike more severely against the former.

30, 31. *The cripple, κυλλους.* E. T. *maimed.* Though *maimed* is sometimes expressed by *κυλλος*, the Gr. word is not confined to this sense, but denotes equally one who wants a limb, and one who has not the use of it. In a relation, such as this, it ought to be rendered in its fullest latitude. Where the context shows it refers to one deprived of a member, as xviii. 8. it should be *maimed*. In v. 31. there is nothing in the Vul. Cop. Ara. Eth. and Sax. versions answering to *κυλλους υγιεις*.

32. *Lest their strength fail, μηποτε εκλυθαι.* E. T. *Lest they faint.* Vul. *Ne deficient.* Be. more explicitly, *Ne viribus deficient.* Cas. to the same purpose, *Ne defatiseantur.* None of these implies so much as the Eng. *to faint*. The Lat. phrase, cor-

responding to it, is *animi deliquium pati*. It appears, indeed, from several passages in the Bible, that when the common translation was made, the Eng. verb *to faint*, meant no more than what we should now express by the phrase, *to grow faint*, to become languid, to fail either in strength or resolution. See Josh. ii. 9. 24. Prov. xxiv. 10. Is. xl. 30, 31. L. xviii. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Gal. vi. 9. Eph. iii. 13. Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

37. *Maunds*, σπυριδας. Ch. xvi. 9, 10. N.

39. *Magdala*, Μαγδαλα. The Vul. *Magedan*; in which it has the concurrence only of the Cam. MS. and of the Sax. version.

CHAPTER XVI.

1. *To try him*, πειραζοντες. E. T. *Tempting*. For the import of the Gr. word, see the note on ch. iv. 7. for there is here no difference in signification, between the simple πειραζω, and the compound εκπειραζω. An. substitutes for this word, *with a captious design*, and Wor. *Captiously*. These expressions neither give the sense, nor are in the spirit, of the Evangelist. I admit that it appears from the story, that those men were *captious*. It is certain, however, that the sacred writer does not call them so, but leaves us to collect it from the naked fact. Their putting questions to make trial of Jesus, did not of itself imply it; that might have proceeded from the best of motives. The historian invariably preserves the same equable tenor, never betraying the smallest degree of warmth against any person, or attempting to prepossess the minds, or work upon the passions, of his readers. There are few mistakes so injurious to the original, as these infusions of a foreign temper.

3. Ὑποκριται. E. T. *Hypocrites*. But this word is not found in some of the most valuable MSS. Nor has it been in those copies from which the Vul. second Sy. Arm. Eth. and Sax. versions were made. Nor was it in the copies used by Chr.

8. *Distrustful*. Ch. vi. 30. 3.

9, 10. *Baskets—maunds*, κοφινους—σπυριδας. E. T. *Baskets—baskets*. In the relation formerly given of both miracles, and here, where our Lord recapitulates the principal circumstances of each, the distinction of the vessels employed for holding the frag-

ments is carefully marked. Now, though our words are not fit for answering entirely the same purpose with the original terms, which probably conveyed the idea of their respective sizes, and consequently of the quantity contained; still there is a propriety in marking, were it but this single circumstance, that there was a difference. A *maund* is a hand-basket. It is mentioned by Thevenot,* as used in the East. Harmer also takes notice of this circumstance, Obs. xxvi. Hence (according to Spelman) the term *Maundy-Thursday*, the name given to the *Thursday* before Easter; because annually, on that day, the king was wont to put into a *maund* or hand-basket, his alms to the poor. All the Lat. and foreign translations I have seen, ancient and modern, Lu.'s alone excepted, make the distinction, though their words are as ill adapted as ours. How it has been overlooked by all the Eng. translators, and, I had almost said, by them only, I cannot imagine.

13. *Who do men say that the Son of man is?* E. T. *Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?* Our translators have been generally very attentive to grammatical correctness. Here they seem to have overlooked it, through attending more to the sound than to the construction of the words in Gr. and La. *Τίνα με λεγουσιν ότι ανθρωποι ειναι, τον υιον του ανθρωπου;* Vul. *Quem dicunt homines esse filium hominis?* It must be *τινα* and *quem*, as agreeing with *με* and *filium hominis* in the accusative, and connected with the substantive verb *ειναι*, and *esse* in the infinitive. Thus, we should say properly, in Eng. *Whom do they take me to be?* for the very same reason; *whom* agreeing with *me* in the accusative, and both suiting the verb *to be* in the infinitive. But in any of these languages, if the sentence be so construed as that the verb is in the indicative or the subjunctive mood, the pronouns must be in the nominative. We say, *Who (not whom) is he?* for the same reason that we should say, *Quis (not quem) est hic?* or *τις (not τινα) εστιν ουτος*. I should not have thought this grammatical criticism worth making, had I not observed that the most of our late translators had, I suppose, through mere inattention, implicitly followed the manner of the Eng. interpreters.

² *That the Son of Man is?* E. T. *That I the Son of Man am?* This is conformable to the common reading. The *με*, however,

* Travels, part I. b. II. ch. xxiv.

was not found in any of the copies used by Jerom. The Vul. Ara. Sax. Cop. and Eth. versions, have no word corresponding to it. Besides, it is unsuitable to the style of the Gospels. In no other passage, where our Lord calls himself *the Son of Man*, does he annex the personal pronoun, or express himself in the first person, but in the third.

18. *Thou art named Rock ; and on this rock, συ ει Πετρος, και επι ταυτη τη πετρα*—E. T. *Thou art Peter ; and upon this rock*—But here the allusion to the name, though specially intended by our Lord, is totally lost. There was a necessity, therefore, in Eng. in order to do justice to the declaration made, to depart a little from the letter. I say in Eng. because in several languages, Lat. Itn. and Fr. for instance, as well as in Sy. and Gr. the name, without any change, shows the allusion.

² *The gates of hades.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 17.

19. *Whatever thou shalt bind—whatever thou shalt loose*—Ch. xviii. 18. N.

20. The name *Jesus* is wanting in many MSS. and some ancient versions.

21. *Began to discover, ηρξατο δεικνυειν.* Mr. v. 17. N.

22. *Taking him aside, προσλαβομενος αυτον.* E. T. *Took him and*—This expression is quite indefinite. Some render the words, *embraced him ;* others, *took him by the hand.* I can discover no authority for either. To take aside evidently suits the meaning which the verb has in other places. In Acts xviii. 26. it cannot be interpreted otherwise. And even in other parts of that book, where the word is used to denote the admission or reception of converts, this sense may be said to be included. An admission into the church was, in several respects, a separation from the world.

² *Reproved him, ηρξατο επιτιμαν αυτω.* Some interpreters, to put the best face on Peter's conduct on this occasion, render the words thus, *Began to expostulate with him.* To translate the verb in this manner, is going just as far to an extreme on one hand, as to translate it *threaten* is going on the other. Mr. ix. 25. N. It cannot be questioned, that when the verb *επιτιμαν* relates to any thing past, it always implies a declaration of censure or blame : and if it be thought that this would infer great presumption in Peter,

it may be asked, Does not the rebuke which he drew on himself, v. 23. from so mild a Master, evidently infer as much? When we consider the prejudices of the disciples, in regard to the nature of the Messiah's kingdom, we cannot be much surprised that a declaration, such as that in v. 21. totally subversive of all their hopes, should produce, in a warm temper, as great impropriety of behaviour as (admitting the ordinary interpretation of the word) Peter was then chargeable with.

³ *God forbid, ἰλεως σοι.* E. T. *Be it far from thee.* In the common use of this phrase in the Sep. it answers exactly to a Heb. word signifying *absit, God forbid.* It is thus also rendered in the common version. See 1 Sam. xiv. 45. 1 Chron. xi. 19. In the Apocrypha the use is the same. Thus, 1 Mac. ii. 21. *ἰλεως ἡμιν καταλιπειν κομον και δικαιωματα* is justly rendered in the common version, *God forbid that we should forsake the law and the ordinances.* In most other places it is translated *far be it.* The sense is the same.

23. *Adversary, Σατανα.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 5.

² *Obstacle, σκανδαλον.* Ch. v. 29. N.

24. *If any man will come, ει τις θελει ελθειν.* Dod. and others, *If any one is willing to come.* I acknowledge that the Eng. verb *will* does not always reach the full import of the Gr. *θελειν*: as *will* with us is sometimes no more than a sign of the future, it does not necessarily suggest volition. But this example does not fall under the remark. In a case like the present, if no more than the futurity of the event were regarded, the auxiliary ought to be *shall*, and not *will*, as thus, 'If it shall be fair weather to-morrow, I will go to such a place.' 'If he shall call on me, I will remind him of his engagement.' In fact, to say 'if any man be *willing* to come' is to say less than 'if any man *will* come.' The former expresses only a present inclination, the latter a resolution strong enough to be productive of its effect. But when put in the form of a question, it is equally good either way. L. xiii. 31. N. J. vii. 17. N.

² *Under my guidance, οπισω μου.* E. T. *After me.* But the Eng. phrase to come after one, means quite another thing.

26. *With the forfeit of his life, την δε ψυχην ζημιωθη.* E. T. *Lose his own soul.* *Forfeit* comes nearer the import of the ori-

ginal word, which Dod. has endeavoured to convey by a circumlocution, *Should be punished with the loss of his life*. But the chief error in the E. T. lies in changing, without necessity, the word answering to *ψυχη*, calling it, in the preceding verse, *life*, and in this *soul*. The expressions are proverbial, importing, ‘It signifies nothing how much a man gain, if it be at the expense of his life.’ That our Lord has a principal eye to the loss of the soul, or of eternal life, there can be no doubt. But this sentiment is couched under a proverb, which, in familiar use, concerns only the present life. That *ψυχη* is susceptible of both meanings is beyond a question.

² *Not give*. Mr. viii. 37. N.

28. *Shall not taste death*. *To taste death, and to see death*, are common Hebraisms for *to die*.

² *Enter upon his reign*; to wit, by the miraculous displays of his power, and the success of his doctrine.

CHAP. XVII.

1. *Apart, κατ' ιδίαν*. As this adverbial expression immediately follows *ορος ὑψηλον*, some have thought that it refers to the situation of the mountain, as standing by itself, far from other mountains, and have thence concluded that the mountain meant was *Tabor* in Galilee, which exactly fits this description, being of a conical figure, surrounded by a plain (Maundrel's Travels.) But it is more agreeable to the ordinary application of the words *κατ' ιδίαν*, to interpret them as denoting the privacy of persons, in particular transactions, and not the situation of places.

2. *As the light, ὡς το φως*. Vul. *Sicut nix*. The Cam. *ὡς χιων*. The Eth. and Sax. versions are the only other authorities for this reading.

4. *Booths, σκηνας*. E. T. *Tabernacles*. The word *σκηνη* denotes not only what we properly call a *tabernacle*, or moveable wooden house, and a *tent*, which is also a sort of portable house, consisting of either cloth or skins, extended on a frame, and easily put up or taken down, but also a temporary *shed* or *booth*, made of the branches of trees, which abounded in the mountainous parts of Judea, where the materials proper for rearing either *tent* or *tabernacle* could not be found on a sudden. It was of such branches that

they reared booths for themselves on *the feast of tabernacles*, which would be more properly styled *the feast of booths*, if changing the name of a festival did not savour of affectation.

11. *To consummate the whole, και αποκαταστησει παντα.* E. T. *And restore all things.* The original sense of the verb αποκαθιστημι is, *instaurō, redintegro, I begin anew.* It is most properly applied to the sun and planets, and in regard to which the finishing and the recommencing of their course are coincident. Besides, their return to the place whence they set out, does, as it were, restore the face of things to what it was at the beginning of their circuit. Hence the word has got two meanings, which, on reflection, are more nearly related than at first they appear to be. One is *to restore*, the other *to finish.* In both senses the word was applicable to the Baptist, who came as a reformer to re-establish that integrity from which men had departed. He came also as the last prophet of the old dispensation, to finish that state of things, and usher in a new one. When it is followed, as in the text, by so comprehensive a word as παντα, without any explanation, it must be understood in the sense of finishing. When the meaning is to restore, there never fails to be some addition made, to indicate the state to which, or the person to whom, the restoration is made. See ch. xii. 13. Mr. iii. 5. viii. 25. L. vi. 10. Acts, i. 6. Heb. xiii. 19. But when the meaning is to finish, no addition is requisite. In the present instance, he shall restore all things, is, to say the least, a very definite expression. This remark must be extended to the verbal noun αποκαταστασις, which, when similarly circumstanced, ought to be rendered *completion, consummation, or accomplishment*, not restoration, re-establishment, or restitution. In Acts iii. 21. Peter says, concerning our Lord, as it stands in the common version, *Whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began.* To me it is manifest that these words, *the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by his prophets*, convey no meaning at all. Substitute *accomplishment* for *restitution*, and there remains not a vestige either of difficulty or of impropriety, in the sentence. I have chosen the verb *to consummate*, in the present instance, as it conveys somewhat of both the senses of αποκαθιστημι. It denotes, to render perfect, which coincides

with the reformation or restoration to integrity, he was sent to promote, and also *to conclude*, or finish, the Mosaic economy. All the La. and most other modern translators, have implicitly followed the Vul. which renders it *restituēt*. Several Eng. interpreters have varied a little, and given at least a more definite sense, some saying *regulate all things*, others, *set all things right*. But some of the Oriental versions, particularly the Sy. and the Per. render it as I have done.

15. *Lunacy*. This man's disease we should, from the symptoms, call *epilepsy*, rather than *lunacy*. But I did not think it necessary to change the name, as the circumstances mentioned sufficiently show the case, whilst the appellation given it (*σεληνιαζεται*) shows the general sentiments at that time, concerning the moon's influence on this sort of malady.

21. *This kind is not dispossessed*. Mr. ix. 29. N.

22. *Is to be delivered up*, *μελλει παραδιδωσθαι*. In my notion of the import of this compound future, there is much the same difference between *παραδοθησεται* and *μελλει παραδιδωσθαι* in Gr. as there is between the phrases *will be delivered* and *is to be delivered* in Eng. The latter gives a hint of the nearness of the event, which is not suggested by the author. Ch. iii. 7. N.

24. *The didrachma*; a tribute exacted for the support of the temple, from which Jesus, as being the Son of God, whose house the temple was, ought to have been exempted.

CHAPTER XVIII.

3. *Unless ye be changed*, *εαν μη στραφητε*. E. T. *Except ye be converted*. But the Eng. term *to convert*, denotes always one or other of these two things, either to bring over from infidelity to the profession of the true religion, or to recover from a state of impenitence to the love and obedience of God. Neither of these appears to be the meaning of the word here. The only view is, to signify that they must lay aside their ambition and worldly pursuits, before they be honoured to be the members, much more the ministers, of that new establishment, or kingdom, he was about to erect. Cas. renders it

very properly *nisi mutati fueritis*, and has in this been followed by some Fr. translators.

6. *An upper millstone, μυλος ονικος. E. T. A millstone.* All the La. translators have rendered it *mola asinaria*, a millstone turned by an ass. All the foreign translations I have seen, adopt this interpretation. That given by Phavorinus appears to me preferable. He explains *μυλος ονικος* the *upper millstone*. *Ονος* alone was a common name for the *upper*, as *μυλη* was for the *nether* millstone. *Μυλος* might denote either. Sometimes an adjective was joined to *ονος*, when used in this sense, to prevent ambiguity. Xenophon calls it *οιος αλετης*. In the same way it appears that Mt. adds to *μυλος*, *millstone*, the epithet *ονικος*, to express the *upper*. I own that, in the version, the last mentioned term, after the example of other Eng. translators, might have been dropt, as not affecting the import of the sentence. But as Mr. has employed a different phrase, *λιθος μυλινος*, which expresses the thing more generally, I always endeavour, if possible, that the Gospels may not appear, in the translation, more coincident, in style and manner, than they are in the original.

7. *Wo unto the world.* L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

10. *Their angels.* It was a common opinion, among the Jews, that every person had a guardian angel assigned to him.

12. *Will he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains, and go. ουχι αφεις τα εννενηκονταεννεα επι τα ορη πορευθεις. E. T. Doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains. Vul. Nonne relinquit nonagintanovem in montibus, et vadit. The Sy. to the same purpose. The Gr. is susceptible of either interpretation, according as we place the comma before, or after, επι τα ορη. The parallel passage, L. xv. 4. which has no ambiguity, decides the question. What is here called ορη is there ερημος. Both terms signify a hilly country, fitter for pasture than for agriculture. Mr. i. 3. N.*

17. *Acquaint the congregation with it, ειπε τη εκκλησια. E. T. Tell it to the church.* I know no way of reaching the sense of our Lord's instructions, but by understanding his words so as they must have been understood, by his hearers, from the use that then prevailed. The word *εκκλησια* occurs frequently in the Sep. and is that

by which the Heb קהל *kahal* is commonly translated. That word we find used in two different, but related senses, in the O. T. One is for a whole nation, considered as constituting one commonwealth or polity. In this sense the people of Israel are denominated *πασα ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰσραηλ*, and *πασα ἡ ἐκκλησία Θεου*. The other is for a particular *congregation* or *assembly*, either actually convened, or accustomed to convene, in the same place. In this sense it was applied to those who were wont to assemble in any particular synagogue; for every synagogue had its own *ἐκκλησία*. And as the word *συναγωγή* was sometimes employed to signify, not the house, but the people; those two Gr. words were often used promiscuously. Now as the nature of the thing sufficiently shows that our Lord, in this direction, could not have used the word in the first of the two senses above given, and required that every private quarrel should be made a national affair, we are under a necessity of understanding it in the last, as regarding the particular congregation to which the parties belonged. What adds great probability to this, as Lightfoot and others have observed, is the evidence we have that the like usage actually obtained in the synagogue, and in the primitive church. Whatever foundation, therefore, there may be, from those books of Scripture that concern a later period, for the notion of a church representative; it would be contrary to all the rules of criticism, to suppose that our Lord used this term in a sense wherein it could not then be understood by any one of his hearers; or that he would say *congregation*, for so the word literally imports, when he meant only a few heads or directors. L. Cl. renders this passage in the same manner, *dites le a l' assemble*. But in ch. xvi. 18. where our Lord manifestly speaks of all, without exception, who, to the end of the world, should receive him as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, I have retained the *church*, as being there perfectly unequivocal. Simon, in effect, gives the same explanation to this verse, that I do: for, though he retains the word *eglise* in the version, he explains it in a note, as importing no more than the particular assembly or congregation to which the parties belong.

18. *Whatsoever ye shall bind, ὅσα ἐὰν δεσῆτε*. The promise made especially to Peter, ch. xvi. 19. is made here to all the apostles. It is with them our Lord is conversing through the whole of this chapter. The Jewish phraseology seems to warrant the expla-

nation of *binding* and *loosing*, by *prohibiting* and *permitting*. The connexion here would more naturally lead us to intrepert it, of *condemning* and *absolving*, thus making it a figurative expression of what is spoken plainly, J. xx. 23. *Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted to them ; and whose sins soever ye retain, they are retained.* It is not impossible that, under the figure of *binding* and *loosing*, both may be comprehended. It is a good rule, in doubtful cases, to translate literally, though obscurely, rather than to run the hazard of mistranslating, by confining an expression to a meaning of which we are doubtful whether it was the author's.

23. *The administration of heaven, ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων.* Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

25. *That he, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, should be sold.* A custom, for the satisfaction of creditors, which, how cruel soever we justly account it, was, in early ages, established by the laws of many countries, in Europe, as well as in Asia, republican, as well as monarchical.

29. *I will pay thee.* The common Gr. adds *παντα*, *all*. But this word is not found in many MSS. several of them of principal note, nor in some ancient versions and editions. Mill and Wetstein have both thought proper to reject it.

34. *To the jailors, τοις βασανισταις.* E. T. *To the tormentors.* The word *βασανιστης* properly denotes *examiner*, particularly one who has it in charge to *examine by torture*. Hence it came to signify *jailor*, for on such, in those days, was this charge commonly devolved. They were not only allowed, but even commanded, to treat the wretches in their custody, with every kind of cruelty, in order to extort payment from them, in case they had concealed any of their effects ; or, if they had nothing, to wrest the sum owed, from the compassion of their relations and friends, who, to release an unhappy person, for whom they had a regard, from such extreme misery, might be induced to pay the debt ; for, let it be observed, that the person of the insolvent debtor was absolutely in the power of the creditor, and at his disposal.

35. *Who forgiveth not from his heart the faults of his brother.* *εαν μη αφητε εκαστος τω αδελφω αυτου απο των καρδιων υμων τα παραπτωματα αυτων.* There is nothing in the Vul. answering

to the three last words. The same may be said of the Ara. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. They are wanting also in the Cam. and three other MSS.

CHAPTER XIX.

1. *Upon the Jordan.* Ch. iv. 15. N.

4. *When the Creator made man, he formed a male and a female,* ὁ ποιήσας, αρθεν και θηλυ εποιησεν αυτους. E. T. *He which made them, made them male and female.* But they could not have translated the clause differently, if the Gr. expression had been αρθεναι και θηλειαι εποιησεν αυτους. Yet it is manifest that the sense would have been different. All that this declaration would have implied is, that when God created mankind, he made people of both sexes. But what argument could have been drawn from this principle to show that the tie of marriage was indissoluble? Or how could the conclusion annexed have been supported? *For this cause a man shall leave father and mother*—Besides, it was surely unnecessary to recur to the history of the creation, to convince those Pharisees of what all the world knew, that the human race was composed of men and women, and consequently of two sexes. The weight of the argument, therefore, must lie in this circumstance, that God created at first no more than a single pair, one of each sex, whom he united in the bond of marriage, and, in so doing, exhibited a standard of that union to all generations. The very words, *and these two*, show that it is implied in the historian's declaration, that they were two, one male and one female, and no more. But this is by no means implied in the common version. It lets us know, indeed, that there were two sexes, but gives us no hint that there were but two persons. Unluckily, Eng. adjectives have no distinction of number; and through this imperfection, there appears here, in all the Eng. translations I have seen, something inconclusive in the reasoning, which is peculiar to them. In our idiom, an adjective, construed with the pronoun *them*, or indeed with any plural noun or pronoun, is understood to be plural. There is, therefore, a necessity, in a case like this, if we would do justice to the original, that the defect, occasioned by our want of inflections, be supplied, by giving the sentence such a turn as will fully express the sense. This

end is here easily effected, as the words *male* and *female*, in our language, may be used either adjectively or substantively. And when they are used as substantives, they are susceptible of the distinction of number.

5. *They two shall be one flesh*, εἶδονται οἱ δυο εἰς σαρκὰ μιαν. This is a quotation from Gen. ii. 24. in which place it deserves our notice, that there is no word answering to *two* in the present Masoretic editions of the Heb. Bible. But, on the other hand, it ought to be observed that the Samaritan copies have this word, that the Sep. reads exactly as the Gospel does. So do also the Vul. the Sy. and the Ara. versions of the O. T. It has been observed of this passage, that it is four times quoted in the N. T. to wit, here, in Mr. x. 8. 1 Cor. vi. 16. and Eph. v. 31. and in none of them is the word *δυο* wanting. The only ancient version, of any consideration, wherein it is not found, is the Chaldee. But with regard to it, we ought to remember, that as the Jewish Rabbies have made greater use of it, in their synagogues and schools, than of any other version, they have had it in their power to reduce it, and in fact have reduced it, to a much closer conformity, than any other, to the Heb. of the Masorets. It is well known how implicitly the Rabbies are followed by their people. And they could not have adopted a more plausible rule than that the translation ought to be corrected by the original. But as there can be no doubt about the authenticity of the reading in the N. T. I think, for the reasons above named, there is the greatest ground to believe, that the ancient reading in the O. T. was the same with this of the New.

7. *Why did Moses command to give a writing of divorcement, and dismiss her?* By the manner in which they put the question, one would imagine that Moses had commanded both, to wit, the dismissal and the writing of divorcement; whereas, in fact, he had only permitted the dismissal; but in case they should use the permission given them, commanded the writing of divorcement.

8. *Untractable disposition*, σκληροκαρδιαν. Diss. IV. § 22.

12. *Let him act this part who can act it*; ὁ δυναμενος χωρειν, χωρειτω. E. T. *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* This expression is rather dark and indefinite. *Χωρειν*, amongst other things, signifies, *to receive, to admit, to be capable of.* It

is applied equally to things speculative, and, in that case, denotes, *to understand, to comprehend*; and to things practical, in which case it denotes, *to resolve, and to execute*. Every body must perceive that the reference here is to the latter of these.

13. *Lay his hands upon them and pray.* It appears to have been customary among the Jews, when one prayed for another who was present, to lay his hand upon the person's head.

17. *Why callest thou me good?* Τι με λεγεις αγαθον Vul. *Quid me interrogas de bono?* Five MSS. read, in conformity to the Vul. Τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου; With this agree also the Cop. the Arm. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. This reading is likewise approved by Origen, and some other ancients after him, and also by some moderns, amongst whom are Er. Gro. Mill, and Ben. The other reading is, nevertheless, in my opinion, preferable, on more accounts than one. Its evidence, from MSS. is beyond comparison superior; the versions on both sides may nearly balance each other: but the internal evidence arising from the simplicity and connexion of the thoughts, is entirely in favour of the common reading. Nothing can be more pertinent than to say, 'If you believe that God alone is good, why do you call me so?' whereas nothing can appear less pertinent than, 'If you believe that God alone is good, why do you consult me concerning the good that you must do?'

² *That life, την ζωην, Diss. X. P. V. § 2.*

20. *The young man replied, All these I have observed from my childhood.* Αελει αυτω ο νεανις, Παντα ταυτα εφυλαξαμην εξ νεοτητος μου. E. T. *The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up.* As he was a young man who made this reply, the import of νεοτης must be *childhood*, as relating to an earlier stage of life, and is, therefore, badly rendered *youth*.

23. *It is difficult for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven.* By the *kingdom of heaven* is sometimes understood in this history, the Christian church, then soon to be erected, and sometimes the state of the blest in heaven, after the resurrection. In regard to this declaration of our Lord, I take it to hold true, in which way soever the kingdom be understood. When it was only by means of persuasion that men were brought into a society, hated and persecuted by all the ruling powers of the earth, Jewish and Pagan; we

may rest assured that the opulent and the voluptuous (characters which, in a dissolute age, commonly go together), who had so much to lose, and so much to fear, would not, among the hearers of the Gospel, be the most easily persuaded. The Apostle James, ii. 5, 6. accordingly attests this to have been the fact; *it was the poor in this world whom God hath chosen rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom; whereas, they were the rich in this world who oppressed them, dragged them before their tribunals, and blasphemed that worthy name by which they were called.* As little can there be any doubt of the justness of the sentiment, in relation to the state of the blessed hereafter, when the deceitfulness of riches, and the snare into which it so often inveigles men, are duly considered. So close an analogy runs through all the divine dispensations, that, in more instances than this, it may be affirmed with truth that the declarations of Scripture are susceptible of either interpretation.

24. *A camel, καμηλον.* The. observes, that some explain the word as signifying here *a cable.* A good authority, however, for signification, though adopted by Cas. who says, *rudentem*, I have never seen. The frequency of the term, amongst all sorts of writers, for representing the beast so denominated, is undeniable. Besides, *the camel*, being the largest animal they were acquainted with in Judea, its name was become proverbial for denoting any thing remarkably large, and *a camel's passing through a needle's eye*, came by consequence, as appears from some rabbinical writings, to express a thing absolutely impossible. Among the Babylonians, in whose country *elephants* were not uncommon, the phrase was *an elephant's passing through a needle's eye*; but the elephant was a stranger in Judea.

² *To pass through the eye of a needle, δια τρυπηματος ραφιδος διελθειν.* A great number of MSS. some of the most valuable, though neither the Al. nor the Cam. instead of *διελθειν* read *εισελθειν*, *enter.* Agreeable to this are both the Sy. the Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions. The Vul. and other versions follow the common reading. Should the external evidence appear balanced on both sides, the common reading is preferable, as yielding a better sense. Passing through a needle's eye is the circumstance in which the impossibility lies. There was no occasion for suggesting whither. There is even something odd in the suggestion, which is very unlike the manner of this author. Wet. adopts the alteration.

28. *That, at the renovation, when the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀζολοθησαντες μοι, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεῖα, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθισέσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρινόντες. E. T. Ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging.* In regard to which version, two things occur to be observed; 1st, That ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεῖα (in which there is an ambiguity, as was remarked in Diss. XII. P. I. § 22.) is rendered, as though it belonged to the preceding clause, ἀζολοθησαντες μοι, whereas the scope of the passage requires, that it be construed with the clause which follows it. 2dly, That the word παλιγγενεῖα is, in this place, better translated *renovation*. We are accustomed to apply the term *regeneration* solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate *the creation*, γενεῆς, a remarkable restoration, or *renovation*, of the face of things, was very suitably termed παλιγγενεῖα. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said on verse 23. holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a *renovation*, or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit, in judgment, that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted.

CHAPTER XX.

1. This chapter, in the original, begins, Ὁμοία γάρ. The γάρ shows manifestly that what follows was spoken in illustration of the sentence with which the preceding chapter concludes, and which, therefore, ought not to have been disjoined from this parable. The

Vul. has no particle answering to *γαρ*. In that version the chapter begins thus, *Simile est regnum cælorum*. But this does not seem to have sprung from a different reading, as there is no diversity here in the Gr. MSS. nor, for aught I can learn, in ancient translations. I rather think that the omission has happened after the division into chapters, and has arisen from a notion of the impropriety of beginning a chapter with the casual particle. It adds to the probability of this, that several old La. MSS. have the conjunction as well as the Gr.

2. *The administration*. Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

6. *Unemployed*, *αργους*, wanting in the Cam. and 2 other MSS. not in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions.

7. *And ye shall receive what is reasonable*, *και ο εαν η δικαιον ληψεθε*. This clause is wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. And there is nothing answering to it in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

13. *Friend*, *εταυρε*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

15. *May not I do what I will with my own?* *ουκ εξεστι μοι ποιησαι ο θελω εν τοις εμοις;* Vul. *Non licet mihi quod volo facere?* Here there is no translation of the words *εν τοις εμοις*, though of manifest importance to the sense. There is the same defect in the Sax. and Arm. versions, but not in any Gr. MS. that has yet appeared, nor in any other translation.

22. *Undergo an immersion like that which I must undergo*, *το βαπτισμα ο εγω βαπτιζομαι βαπτισθηναι*. E. T. *To be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with*. The primitive signification of *βαπτισμα* is *immersion*, of *βαπτιζειν*, *to immerse, plunge, or overwhelm*. The noun ought never to be rendered *baptism*, nor the verb *to baptise*, but when employed in relation to a religious ceremony. The verb *βαπτιζειν* sometimes; and *βαπτειν*, which is synonymous, often occurs in the Sep. and Apocryphal writings, and is always rendered in the common version by one or other of these words, *to dip, to wash, to plunge*. When the original expression, therefore, is rendered in familiar language, there appears nothing harsh or extraordinary in the metaphor. Phrases like these, *to be overwhelmed with grief, to be immersed in affliction*, will be found common in most languages.

It is proper here farther to observe, that the whole of this clause, and that corresponding to it, in the subsequent verse, are in this Gospel wanting in the Vul. and several MSS. As they are found, however, in the far greater number both of ancient versions, and of MSS. and perfectly coincide with the scope of the passage, I did not think there was weight enough in what might be urged, on the opposite side, to warrant the omission of them ; neither indeed does Wet. But Gro. and Mill are of the contrary opinion.

23. *I cannot give, unless to those, ουκ εστιν εμου δουναι, αλλ' ους.* E. T. *Is not mine to give ; but it shall be given to them.* The conjunction *αλλα*, when, as in this place, it is not followed by a verb, but by a noun or pronoun, is generally to be understood as of the same import with *ει μη, nisi, unless, except*, Otherwise, the verb must be supplied, as is done here, in the common version. But as such an ellipsis is uncommon, recourse ought not to be had to it without necessity. Of the interpretation I have given of the conjunction *αλλα*, we have an example, Mr. ix. 8. compared with Mt. xvii. 8. Vul. *Non est meum dare vobis.* See Mr. x. 40. N.

26. *Servant, διακονος.* E. T. *Minister.* } In the proper and
 27 *Slave, δουλος.* E. T. *Servant.* } and primitive sense
 of *διακονος*, it is a *servant* who attends his master, waits on him at table, and is always near his person, to obey his orders, which was accounted a more creditable kind of service. By the word *δουλος* is not only meant *a servant* in general (whatever kind of work he be employed in,) but also *a slave*. It is solely from the scope and connexion that we must judge, when it should be rendered in the one way, and when in the other. In the passage before us, the view in both verses is to signify, that the true dignity of the Christian will arise more from the service he does to others, than the power he possesses over them. We are to judge, therefore, of the value of the words from the import of those they are contrasted with. And as desiring to be *great* is a more moderate ambition than desiring to be *chief*, we naturally conclude, that as the word opposed to the former should be expressive of some of the inferior stations in life, that opposed to the latter must be expressive of the lowest. When this sufficiently suits the ordinary signification of the words, there

can hardly remain any doubt. As this is manifestly the case here, I did not know any words in our language by which I could better express a difference in degree, so clearly intended, than the words *servant* and *slave*. The word *minister*, is now appropriated to the servants, not of private masters, but of the public. It is from the distinctions in private life, well known at the time, that our Lord's illustrations are borrowed.

31. *Charged them to be silent*, *επειτιμησεν αυτοις ινα σιωπηθωσιν*. E. T. *Rebuked them, because they should hold their peace*. The historian surely did not mean to blame the poor men for their importunity. Our Lord, on the contrary, commends such importunity, sometimes expressly in words, and always by making the application successful. But to render *ινα* *because*, appears quite unexampled. It answers commonly to the La. *ut*, sometimes to *ita ut*, but never, as far as I remember, to *quia*. It is rendered *ut* in this passage in all the La. versions. The import of *ινα* ascertains the sense of *επειτιμαω*, which is frequently translated *to charge*, even in the common version. In proof of this, several places might be produced: but I shall only refer the reader to the parallel passage in Mr. x. 48. where *επειτιμων αυτω πολλοι ινα σιωπηθη* is translated, *Many charged him that he should hold his peace*; and to Mr. ix. 25. N.

CHAPTER XXI.

4. *Now all this was done, that the words of the prophet might be fulfilled*, *τουτο δε ολον γεγονεν, ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου*. Our Lord's perfect knowledge of all that the prophets had predicted concerning him, gives a propriety to this manner of rendering these words, when every thing is done by his direction, which it could not have in any other circumstances.

5. *The daughter of Zion*, that is, *Jerusalem*, so named from Mount Zion, which was in the city, and on which was erected a fortress for its defence. This poetical manner of personifying the cities and countries, to which they addressed themselves, was familiar to the prophets.

² From the other Evangelists it would appear, that our Lord rode only on the colt; from this passage, we should be apt to think

that both had been used. But it is not unusual with the sacred authors, when either the nature of the thing spoken of, or the attendant circumstances, are sufficient for precluding mistakes, to employ the plural number for the singular.

7. *Covering them with their mantles*, ἐπεθησαν επανω αυτων τα ιματια αυτων. The Sy. interpreter, either from a different reading in the copies he used, or (which is more likely) from a desire to express the sense more clearly, has rendered it *they laid their mantles on the colt*.

9. *Blessed be he that cometh*, εὐλογημενος ὁ ερχομενος. E. T. *Blessed is he that cometh*. But acclamations of this kind are always of the nature of prayers, or ardent wishes; like the Fr. *vive le roy*, or our *God save the king*. Nay, the words connected are entirely of this character. *Hosanna to the Son of David*, is equivalent to *God preserve the Son of David*; and consequently what follows is the same as *prosperous be the reign of him that cometh in the name of the Lord*.

* *In the highest heaven*. L. ii. 14. N.

12. *The temple*, το ιερον. Let it be observed that the word here is not ναος. By the latter, was meant properly *the house*, including only the vestibule, the holy place or sanctuary, and the most holy. Whereas the former comprehended all the courts. It was in the outermost court that this sort of traffic was exercised. For want of peculiar names in European languages, these two are confounded in most modern translations. To the ναος, or temple, strictly so called, none of those people had access, not even our Lord himself, because not of the posterity of Aaron. L. i. 9. N. It may be thought strange that the Pharisees, whose sect then predominated, and who much affected to patronize external decorum in religion, should have permitted so gross a violation of decency. But, let it be remembered that the merchandize was transacted in the court of the Gentiles, a place allotted for the devotions of the proselytes of the gate, those who having renounced idolatry, worshipped the true God, but did not subject themselves to circumcision and the ceremonial law. To the religious service of such, the narrow-souled Pharisees paid no regard. The place they did not account holy. It is even not improbable that in order to put an indignity on those half-conformists, they have introduced, and promoted, this flagrant abuse.

The zeal of our Lord, which breathed nothing of the pharisaical malignity, tended as much to unite and conciliate, as theirs tended to divide and alienate. Nor was there any thing in the leaven of the Pharisees, which he more uniformly opposed, than that assuming spirit, the surest badge of the sectary, which would confine the favour of the universal parent to those of his own sect, denomination, or country. See ch. viii. 11, 12. L. iv. 23, &c. x. 29, &c.

13. *A house.* Mr. xi. 17.

² *Of robbers, ληστων.* E. T. *Of thieves.* Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

25. *Whence had John authority to baptise?* το βαπτισμα Ιωαννου ποθεν ην; E. T. *The baptism of John, whence was it?* But a man's baptism means, with us, solely his partaking of that ordinance; whereas this question relates, not to John's receiving baptism, but to his right to enjoin and confer baptism. The question, as it stands in the common version, conveys, to the unlearned reader, a sense totally different from the author's. It sounds, as though it had been put, 'Was John baptised by an angel, sent from heaven on purpose, or by an ordinary man?' In all such cases, if one would neither be unintelligible, nor express a false meaning, one must not attempt to trace the words of the original. Diss. XII. P. I. § 14.

31. *The first, ο πρωτος.* In the old Itc. it was *novissimus*. The Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. read in the same manner. In the Cam. and two other Gr. MSS. it is *ο εσχατος*. This is one of those readings which it would require more than ordinary external evidence to authorise.

32. *In the way of sanctity, εν οδω δικαιοσυνης.* E. T. *In the way of righteousness.* This is one proof among many of the various significations given to the word *δικαιοσυνη* in the N. T. There can be no doubt that this is spoken principally in allusion to the austerities of John's manner of living in the desert, in respect of food, raiment, and lodging. The word *sanctity*, in our language, though not quite so common, suits the meaning here better than *righteousness*.

33. *Went abroad, απεδημησεν.* E. T. *Went into a far country.* This is an exact translation of what is said of the prodigal, L. xv. 13. *απεδημησεν εις χωραν μακαραν*, but not of what is

said here. The word *απεδημησεν* implies barely that it was a foreign country he went to ; nothing is added to inform us whether it was *far* or *near*.

35. *Drove away with stones another, ὃν δε ελιθοβολησαν.* E. T. *Stoned another.* But *λιθοβολειν* does not always denote to kill by stoning, as the Eng. word *stoned* seems to imply. That it does not signify so in this place, is evident from the distinction made in the treatment given, *ὃν δε απεκτειναν.*

36. *More respectable, πλειονας των πρωτων.* E. T. *More than the first.* *πλειονας* means *more* either *in number*, or *in value*. As vouchers for the latter use in the N. T. see Mt. v. 20. vi. 25. xii. 41, 42. Mr. xii. 33. L. xi. 31, 32. Heb. xi. 4. The Heb. *rab* signifies both *many* and *great*. The reasons which have induced me, on reconsidering this passage, to prefer, with Markland, the 2d meaning, are these. 1. If the number of servants first sent had been mentioned, or even alluded to by an epithet as *many*, or *few*, *πλειονας* could not have been rendered otherwise than *in greater number* ; but not, where there is neither mention of number, nor allusion to it. 2. A climax is evidently intended by the historian, in representing the husbandmen, as proceeding from evil to worse. Now the climax is much better supported by making *πλειονας* relate to dignity, than by making it refer to number. He first sent some inferior servants ; afterwards, the most respectable ; last of all, his son.

41. *He will put those wretches to a wretched death, κακους κακως απολεσει αυτους.* E. T. *He will miserably destroy those wicked men.* This idiom is entirely Grecian. Lucian says *κακοι κακως απολουνται, Icaromenippus*. Several other examples have been produced by Sc. and Wa. I have been lucky enough here to express the meaning, without losing the paronomasia, which is not without its emphasis. *Wretches* and *wretched*, like *κακους* and *κακως*, are equally susceptible of both significations, *wicked* and *miserable*. It is not possible always, in translating to convey both the sense and the trope. And when both cannot be done, no reasonable person will be at a loss which to prefer.

43. *Know therefore.* This is one of the clearest predictions of the rejection of the Jews, and of the call of the Gentiles, which we have in this history.

^a *To a nation, εθνη.* Some render the word *To the Gentiles*. That the Gentiles are meant, cannot be doubted. But the Eng.

(especially where there is no risk of mistake) ought not to be more explicit than the Gr. Had it been our Lord's intention flatly to tell them this, his expression would have been, *τοις εθνεσι*. The article and the plural number are invariably used in such cases. They are here called a *nation*, because, though collected out of many nations, they will as christians constitute *one nation*, the *εθνος αγιον* mentioned 1 Pet. ii. 9.

CHAPTER XXII.

12. *Friend, εταιρε*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

14. *For there are many called, but few chosen, πολλοι γαρ ειδη κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι*. E. T. *For many are called, but few are chosen*. The difference in these two ways of rendering is, to appearance, inconsiderable, but it is real. Let it be observed, that the Gr. words *κλητοι* and *εκλεκτοι* are merely adjectives; *called* and *chosen*, in the E. T. can be understood no otherwise than as participles, insomuch that, if we were to turn the Eng. into Gr. we should use neither of those words, but say, *Πολλοι γαρ ειδη κεκλημενοι, ολιγοι δε εκλελεγμενοι*, which does not perfectly coincide in meaning with the expression of the Evangelist. I acknowledge, it is impossible to mark the difference, with equal precision, in any language, which has only one term for both uses. The distinction with us is similar, and nowise inferior to that which is found between Olivetan's, and more modern Fr. versions. The former says, *Plusieurs sont appellés, mais peu sont élus*; the latter, *Il y a beaucoup d'appellés, mais peu d'élus*.

16. *Herodians*. Probably partizans of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee; those who were for the continuance of the royal power in the descendants of Herod the Great. This was an object which, it appears, the greater part of the nation, especially the Pharisees, did not favour. They considered that family, not indeed as idolaters, but as great conformists to the idolatrous customs of both Greeks and Romans, whose favour it spared no pains to secure. The notion, adopted by some, that the Herodians were those who believed Herod to be the Messiah, hardly deserves to be men-

tioned, as there is no evidence that such an opinion was maintained by any body.

18. *Malice, πονηριαν.* Ch. xxv. 26. N.

^a *Dissemblers, ὑποκριται.* E. T. *Hypocrites.* Diss. III. § 24.

19. *A denarius.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 4.

23. *Who say that there is no future life, οἱ λεγοντες μη ειναι αναστασιν.* E. T. *Which say that there is no resurrection.* The word *αναστασις*, or rather the phrase, *αναστασις των νεκρων*, is indeed the common term, by which *the resurrection*, properly so called, is denominated in the N. T. Yet this is neither the only, nor the primitive, import of the word *αναστασις*. It denotes simply, being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state, after an interruption. The verb *ανιστημι* has the like latitude of signification; and both words are used in this extent by the writers of the N. T. as well as by the Seventy. Agreeably therefore to the original import, *rising* from a seat is properly termed *αναστασις*, so is *awaking* out of sleep, or *promotion* from an inferior condition. The word occurs in this last sense, L. ii. 34. In this view when applied to the dead, the word denotes, properly, no more than a *renewal of life*, to them, in whatever manner this happen. Nay, that the Pharisees themselves did not universally mean, by this term, the re-union of soul and body, is evident from the account which the Jewish historian gives of their doctrine, as well as from some passages in the Gospels; of both which I had occasion to take notice in Diss. VI. P. II. § 19. To say, therefore, in Eng. in giving the tenets of the Sadducees, that *they deny the resurrection*, is, at least, to give a very defective account of their sentiments on this very topic. It is notorious, not only from Josephus, and other Jewish writers, but from what is said, Acts xxiii. 8. that they denied the existence of angels, and all separate spirits. In this they went much farther than the Pagans, who did indeed deny what Christians call *the resurrection of the body*, but acknowledged a state after death, wherein the souls of the departed exist, and receive the reward, or the punishment, of the actions done upon the earth. But not only is the version here given a juster representation of the Sadducean hypothesis, at the same time that it is entirely conformable to the sense of the word, but it is the only version which makes our Lord's argument appear pertinent, and levelled

against the doctrine he wanted to refute. In the common version, they are said to deny the resurrection, that is, that the soul and the body shall hereafter be re-united; and our Lord brings an argument from the Pentateuch to prove—What? not that they shall be re-united (to this it has not even the most distant relation,) but that the soul survives the body, and subsists after the body is dissolved. This many would have admitted, who denied the resurrection. Yet so evidently did it strike at the root of the scheme of the Sadducees, that they were silenced by it, and, to the conviction of the hearers, confuted. Now this, I will take upon me to say, could not have happened, if the fundamental error of the Sadducees had been, barely, the denial of the resurrection of the body, and not the denial of the immortality of the soul, or rather of its actual subsistence after death, for I speak not here of what some call the natural immortality of the soul. If possible, the words in L. xx. 38. *παντες αυτω ζωσιν*, make it still more evident, that our Lord considered this as all that was incumbent on one who would confute the Sadducees, to prove, namely, that the soul continued to live after the person's natural death. Now, if this was the subversion of Sadduceism, Sadduceism must have consisted in denying that the soul continues to live, separated from the body, or, which is nearly the same, in affirming, that the dissolution of the union is the destruction of the living principle. It may be objected, that in v. 28. there is a clear reference to what is specially called *the resurrection*, which, by the way, is still clearer from the manner wherein it is expressed, Mr. xii. 23. *εν τη ουν αναστασει, οταν αναστωσι*. This mode of expression, so like a tautology, appears, to me, to have been adopted by that Evangelist, on purpose to show that he used the word *αναστασις* here, in a more confined sense than he had done in the preceding part of the story. The Sadducee, as is common with disputants, thinks it sufficient, for supporting his own doctrine, to show some absurdity in that of his antagonist. And he considers it as furnishing him with a better handle for doing this, to introduce upon the scene, the woman, and the seven claimants, all at once, who are no sooner raised than they engage in contests about their property in her. But this is no reason why we should not interpret our Lord's words, and the words of the historian, relating to the opinions of the sect, in all the latitude which the nature of the subject, and the context, evidently

show to belong to them. The only modern version I have seen, wherein *αναστασις* is rendered *future life*, is the Eng An.

24. *Leave no children, μη εχων τεκνα.* Vul. *Non habens filium.* It may be doubted whether this version has proceeded from a different reading, as it is quite unsupported either by MSS. or by other translations. But it agrees exactly with the Heb. in the passage of Deut. xxv. 5. referred to. The words are there לו אין בן. The sense is the same in both, as in several instances the Heb. *ben* is used for a child indefinitely, of either sex. In the place quoted, the words are rendered in the Vul. *absque liberis*, and in the E. T. *have no child.*

34. *God is not a God of the dead, ουκ εστιν ο Θεος, Θεος νεκρων.* Vul. *Non est Deus mortuorum.* The Sy. Sax. and Cop. agree with the Vul. in using no word answering to the first *ο Θεος*, which is also omitted in the Cam. Dr. Priestley says [Harmony, sect. lxxii.] “This argument of our Saviour’s evidently goes on the supposition of there being no intermediate state.” Now, to me it is evident, that the direct scope of the argument is to prove, that there is such a state, or, at least, that the soul survives the body, and is capable of enjoyment after the natural death. The reason which the Doctor has subjoined, is, if possible, more wonderful still. “For, admitting,” says he, “this [intermediate state,] God might, with the strictest propriety, be said to be the God of those patriarchs, as they were then living, and happy, though their bodies were in the grave.” Is it then a maxim with this learned gentleman, that nothing can be admitted which would show the words to be strictly proper, and the reasoning conclusive? So it appears; for, in perfect consistency with this maxim, he concludes his explanation (if I may so call it) with these remarkable words: “There does not, however, seem to be much force in the argument, except with the Jews, to whom it was addressed, and who admitted similar constructions of Scripture. For, though Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were perished, the person, who spake to Moses might make himself known to him, as he whom they had worshipped.” If so, this critic should have said, not that there was not much force, but that there was no force at all, in the argument. The whole then of this memorable confutation,

amounts, according to him, to no more than an argument *ad hominem*, as logicians term it, that is, a fallacious argument, which really proves nothing, and is adopted solely, because the medium, though false, is admitted by the antagonist, who is therefore not qualified to detect the fallacy. But unluckily, in the present case, if the argument be inconclusive, it has not even that poor advantage of being an argument *ad hominem*. The Doctor should have remembered that our Lord, in this instance, was disputing with Sadducees, who paid no regard to the traditionary interpretations, and mystical constructions, of Scripture, admitted by the Pharisees. Yet even these Sadducees were put to silence by it. The truth is, our Lord's argument stands in no need of such a lame apology, as that it is an argument *ad hominem*. Consider it as it lies, without the aid of artificial comments, and it will be found evidently decisive of the great point in dispute with the Sadducees, whether the soul perished with the body. 'God,' says our Lord, 'when he appeared to Moses in the Bush, which was long after the death of the Patriarchs, said to him, *I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; now God is not a God of the dead*, of those who, being destitute of life, and consequently of sensibility, can neither know nor honour him; he is the God of those only who love and adore him, and are, by consequence, alive.' These Patriarchs, therefore, though dead, in respect of us who enjoy their presence here no longer, are alive, in respect of God, whom they still serve and worship. However true then it may be, as the Doctor remarks, that "though Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were perished, the person who spoke to Moses might make himself known to him, as he whom they had worshipped," this remark does not suit the present case: nor could the words of God, on that supposition, have been the same with those which we find recorded by the sacred penman. For God, as in the passage quoted, made himself known to Moses, not as he whom the Patriarchs had worshipped, but expressly as he whom they then worshipped; for he says not, *I was* the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, to wit, when the Patriarchs lived upon the earth, but, *I am* their God at present. It is manifestly from this particularity in the expression, which cannot, without straining, be adapted, either to the past or to the future, that Jesus concludes they were then living. Nor let it be thought too slight a circumstance

for an argument of this importance to rest upon. The argument is, in effect, founded, as all reasoning from revelation, in the veracity of God; but the import of what God says, as related in Scripture, we must, not in this instance only, but in every instance, infer from the ordinary construction and idioms of language. When the Creator, in treating with his creatures, condescends to employ their speech; as his end is to inform, and not to deceive, his words must be interpreted by the common rules of speaking, in the same way wherein we should interpret what is said by any of our fellow-creatures. Now, if we should overhear one man say to another, 'I wish to have you in my service, and to be your master, as I am your father's and your grandfather's, master;' should we not conclude that the persons spoken of are alive, and his servants at this very moment? And would it not be reasonable to insist that, if they were dead, his expression would be, 'As I was your father's, and your grandfather's master?' This is, in effect, the explanation given of the reasoning in this passage, by the most ancient Gr. expositors, Chr. Euth. and The. I know it is urged, on the other side, that though the verb *εἰμι* is used in the Gr. of the Evangelist, and in the Sep. there is nothing which answers to it in the Heb. and consequently, the words of Moses might as well have been rendered *I was*, as *I am*. But this consequence is not just. The Heb. has no present of the indicative. This want, in active verbs, is supplied by the participle; in the substantive verb, by the juxtaposition of the terms to which that verb in other languages serve as the copula. The absence of the verb, therefore, is as much evidence in Heb. that what is affirmed or denied, is meant of the present time, as the form of the tense is in Gr. or La. Wherever either the past or the future is intended by the speaker, as the Orientals are not deficient in these tenses, the verb is not left to be supplied by the hearer. Thus God says to Joshua (ch. i. 5,) *As I was with Moses*, that is, when he was employed in conducting the sons of Israel in the wilderness, *so will I be with thee*. The verb is expressed in both clauses. See also v. 17. and 1 Ki. viii. 57. All which examples are, except in the single circumstance of time, perfectly similar to this of the Evangelist; and are sufficient evidence that, where the substantive verb is not expressed, but the personal pronoun is immediately conjoined with what is affirmed, the sense must, in other languages, be exhibited by the

present. Now, to make the force of the argument, as certain expositors have done, result from something implied in the name *God*, is to convert it into a mere sophism. To affirm that the term itself includes the perpetual preservation of the worshippers, is to take for granted the whole matter in dispute. To have argued thus with a Sadducee, would have been ridiculous. In Scripture, as every where else, the God of any persons or people, means simply that which is acknowledged by them, and worshipped as such. Thus, Dagon is called the god of the Philistines (Jud. xvi. 23.), and Baalzebub the god of Ekron (2 Ki. i. 3.) But the sacred writers surely never meant to suggest that these gods were the authors of such blessings to their worshippers. Nay, it is not even clear that the latter ever expected such blessings from them. What seems to have occasioned the many unnatural turns that have been given to this argument, by later commentators, is solely the misunderstanding of the word *αναστασις*, through not attending to the latitude of signification wherein it was often used in the days of the Apostles. Nor is this the only term in which the modern use does not exactly tally with the ancient.

34. *Flocked about him, συνηχθησαν επι το αυτο.* E. T. *Were gathered together.* In this interpretation, the clause *επι το αυτο*, is a mere pleonasm, as *συνηχθησαν* alone implies the whole. Now let it be observed, that thus much might have been affirmed, in whatever place the Pharisees had met; whereas it is the manifest design of the Evangelist to acquaint us, that the preceding confutation of the Sadducees occasioned a concourse of Pharisees to him, which gave rise to the following conversation. I approve, therefore, the way in which Cas. has understood the words *επι το αυτο*, who says, *coiverunt eodem*; and not that which has been adopted by the Vul. and Er. who say, *convenerunt in unum*; or by the Zu. translator, who says, *convenerunt simul*; which has been followed by our translators, and which, in effect, destroys the connexion of the passages. The Cam. reads *επ' αυτον*; but, as in this it is singular, we can lay no stress on it. We can only say, that it is of the less consequence, as it makes no difference on the sense. Be. who adopts that reading, says, *aggregati sunt apud eum.*

35. *A lawyer, νομικος.* Diss. VII. P. II. § 2, 3. and Diss. XII. P. V. § 12.

42. *Whose son should he be ? τινος υἱος εἶστι ;* E. T. *Whose son is he ?* The indicative mood, in the Gr. of the N. T. has often all the extent which is given to that mood in Heb. where it supplies most of the other moods. The import of it in this place is justly rendered in Fr. both by L. Cl. and by Beau. *De qui doit il etre fils ?* which answers exactly to the way I have translated it.

43. *Call him his Lord.* Diss. VII. P. I. § 8.

CHAPTER XXIII.

2. *Sit in Moses' chair.* The Jewish Doctors always taught sitting.

5. *Phylacteries, φυλακτηρια.* A Gr. word exactly corresponding in etymology to the word *conservatories*. They were scrips of parchment used for preserving some sentences of the law written on them, which, from the literal interpretation of Deut. vi. 8. they thought themselves obliged, on several occasions, especially at their prayers, to wear bound upon their forehead, and on their left arm.

8. *Assume not the title of rabbi, for ye have only one teacher, μη κληθητε ραββι, εις γαρ εστιν υμων ο καθηγητης.* E. T. *Be not ye called rabbi, for one is your master.* Vul. *Vos nolite vocari rabbi, unus est enim magister vester.* The Vul. seems to have read *διδασκαλος*, where it is in the common Gr. *καθηγητης*; for *διδασκαλος*, is commonly rendered in that version *magister*; and *διδασκαλος*, is given by John (i. 39.) as an interpretation into Gr. of the Sy. *rabbi*. At the same time, it must be owned, this conclusion, in regard to the reading found in the copies used by the Lat. translator, does not possess a high degree of probability, inasmuch as the word *καθηγητης* is twice rendered by him *magister* in v. 10. The same may be said of the Sax. and, perhaps, some other versions. But it is equally evident, that the Sy. interpreter has read differently. For the word *καθηγητης*, in v. 10. (where there is no such difference of reading,) is by him, as it ought to be, rendered by a word signifying *leader*, or *guide*; whereas the term *rabbi* is repeated in v. 8. agreeably to his uniform practice in rendering the Gr. *διδασκα-*

λος. Beside this evidence of a different reading, there is a great number of Gr. MSS. which read *διδασκαλος*, v. 8. This reading is approved by Orig. and Chr. and many modern critics; amongst whom are Gro. Drusius, Be. Selden, De Dieu, Mill, and Ben. The internal evidence is entirely in favour of this reading. The sense requires that the term, in the latter clause, be equivalent to *rabbi* in the former. That *διδασκαλος* is such a term, we learn, not only from the Evangelist John, in the place above quoted, but from the use of the Sy. interpreter, who always renders the one term by the other; whereas *καθηγητης* has, in that version, a distinct interpretation in v. 10. Further, in v. 10. in the common Gr. we find the disciples prohibited from assuming the title of *καθηγητης*, for the very reason repeated which we find given in v. 8. for their not assuming the title of *rabbi*. Thus it stands in the two verses: "Assume not the title of *rabbi*, for ye have only one *cathegetes*; assume not the title of *cathegetes*, for ye have only one *cathegetes*." For my part, I have seen no instance of such a tautology, or so little congruity of expression, in any of the instructions given by our Lord. I therefore approve, in v. 8. the reading of the Sy. interpreter, which is also the reading of many MSS. replacing *διδασκαλος*, which is perfectly equivalent to *rabbi*. I also think, with that interpreter, that our Lord meant, in the 10th verse, to say something further than he had already said in the 8th. I acknowledge that the sentiments are nearly related; but if there had not been some difference, there would have been no occasion for recurring to a different, and even unusual, term. Our Lord, in my opinion, the more effectually to enforce this warning against an unlimited veneration for the judgments and decisions of men, as a most important lesson, puts it in a variety of lights, and prohibits them from regarding any man with an implicit and blind partiality, as teacher, father, or guide. Now this end is not answered, if all or any two of them be rendered as synonymous. The very uncommonness of the word *καθηγητης* (for it occurs in no other place of the N. T.) shows an effort to say something more than was comprehended in the preceding words. And let it be observed, that whatever serves to prove that its meaning is not coincident with *διδασκαλος*, serves also to prove that it is not the authentic reading in v. 8th.

² *The Messiah, ὁ Χριστός*. This is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions, and in a few MSS.; but the authorities,

both in weight and number, are greatly in its favour. It makes, however, no difference in the sense : because, if not read, the context manifestly supplies it.

9. *And all ye are brethren.* In the common Gr. the words answering to these, to wit, *παντες δε υμεις αδελφοι εστε*, are placed in the end of the preceding verse, with which they have little connexion. I have followed a considerable number of copies, in transposing them to the end of verse 9th, immediately after, *he alone is your Father who is in heaven*, with which they are intimately connected. The arrangement is manifestly more natural, gives a closer connexion to the sentiments, and throws more light on the passage than the common arrangement, which places this clause at the end of v. 8. and thereby adds an abruptness to the whole. The intrinsic evidence is therefore entirely in favour of the change.

12. *Whoever will exalt himself shall be humbled ; and whoever will humble himself, shall be exalted*, *οστις υψωσει εαυτον ταπεινωθησεται και οστις ταπεινωσει εαυτον, υψωθησεται.* E. T. *Whosoever shall exalt himself, shall be abased ; and he that shall humble himself, shall be exalted.* What has induced our translators to render the verb *ταπεινωειν* differently in these two clauses, in one, *to abase*, in the other, *to humble*, it would not be easy to say. *To humble* is, in respect of meaning, equally well adapted to both. When that is the case, a change, by weakening the antithesis, hurts the energy of the expression. In the parallel passages, L. xiv. 11. xviii. 14. they make the same variation. I do not find this mode of rendering, adopted by any ancient, or any foreign, interpreter. It seems peculiar to Eng. translators, some of whom before, and some since, the publication of the common version have taken this method.

13, 14, 15, 16. 23. 25. 27. 29. *Woe unto you, οναι υμιν.* L. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

14. *Use long prayers for a disguise*, *προφασει μακρα προσευχομενοι*, E. T. *For a pretence make long prayer.* This is rather too elliptical, and consequently obscure. Otherwise it does not differ in import from that here given. For what is a *pretence*, but a false appearance employed for concealing the truth ? The true motive of their attention and assiduities was avarice : devotion was on-

ly their mask. This verse is wanting in some MSS. in others it is transposed, being placed before the 13th.

² *Punishment, κριμα.* E. T. *Damnation.* Mr. xii. 40 N.

16. 18. *Bindeth not, ουδεν εστιν.* E. T. *It is nothing* ; that is ' Though it is, in appearance, it is not, in reality, an oath ; it has not the power of binding.'

19. *Foolish and blind, μωροι και τυφλοι.* The words *μωροι και* are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. The like defect is found in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

23. *Dill, το ανηθον.* E. T. *Anise.* In the same way it is rendered in all the Eng. versions I have seen. Yet *ανηθον* does not mean *anise*, but *dill*. Our translators have been first misled by a mere resemblance in sound, and afterwards implicitly copied by all their successors. This mistake, though of small consequence, is the more remarkable, as no other but Eng. translators seem to have fallen into it. All the La. interpreters say rightly *anethum*, the Itn. *aneto*, the Fr. *aneth*, Lu. in his Ger. version says *till*, and the Sax. version is *δile*. It is the more observable, as in most of those languages, the word for *anise* has the like resemblance in sound to *ανεθον*, with the Eng. word, though with them it has occasioned no mistake. Thus, *anise* is, in Gr. *ανισον*, in La. *anisum*, in Itn. *aniso*, and in Fr. *anis*.

² *Justice, humanity, and fidelity, την κριβιν, και τον ελεον, και την πιστιν.* E. T. *Judgment, mercy, and faith.* The word *judgment* in our language, when it has any relation to the distribution of justice, never means the virtue or duty of judging justly, but either the right of judging, the act of judging, or the result of judging, that is, the doom or sentence given, right or wrong : sometimes, when spoken in reference to the celestial Judge, it means the effect of that sentence, the punishment inflicted. To this the Gr. *κριμα* more properly corresponds ; though it must be owned, that the word *κρισις*, which, by analogy, should be rather *judicatio* than *judicium*, is also often used to denote it. But it is evident, that the word *κρισις* likewise signifies *distributive justice*, and even sometimes *justice* in the largest acceptation. It is in this place rendered by Cas. *jus*, and by the five Fr. translators, P. R. Si. Sa. L. Cl. and Beau. *la justice*. For the meaning of *τον ελεον*, see ch. ix. 13. ² N. *Fidelity*, or

faithfulness, is agreed, on all sides, to be the meaning of *την πιστιν* here, where it is ranked among the social virtues.

24. *Who strain your liquor, to avoid swallowing a gnat, οι διυλιζοντες τον κωνωπα.* E. T. *Who strain at a gnat.* I do not understand the import of this expression. Some have thought, that it has sprung originally from a mere typographical error of some printer, who has made it *strain at*, instead of *strain out*. Accordingly, most of the late Eng. translators have said *strain out*. Yet this expression, *strain out a gnat*, it must be confessed, sounds very oddly; and it may be justly questioned, whether any good Eng. authority can be produced for such a manner of construing the verb. For this reason, I thought it safer here, though with the aid of circumlocution, to give what is evidently the sense.

25. *Which within are laden, εσωθεν δε γεμουσιν.* Vul. *Intus autem pleni estis.* This has, doubtless, sprung from a different reading, but is quite unsupported.

² *Iniquity, ακρασιας.* Vul. *Immunditia.* E. T. *Excess.* But there is such a general consent of MSS. and Fathers, with the Sy. Ara. and Eth. versions, for the word *αδικιας*, that it is hardly possible to doubt of its being the genuine reading. Besides, it suits much better with all the accounts we have, in other places, of the character of the Pharisees, who are never, as far as I remember, accused of intemperance, though often of injustice. The former vice is rarely found with those who, like the Pharisees, make great pretensions to religion.

32. *Fill ye up then, και υμεις πληρωσατε.* A very few copies, and those not of the highest value, read *επληρωσατε*, *Ye have filled up*; or interrogatively, *Do ye fill up?* But as they are unsupported alike by ancient versions and ecclesiastical writers, this reading cannot be admitted. I see no difficulty in considering the words as an ironical order, which is always understood to be a severe reproach like that in the *Æneid*, lib. v. *I sequere Italiam ventis.* Irony is a trope which several times occurs in Scripture; and we have, at least, one other instance, Mr. vii. 9. of its having been used by our Saviour. Ch. xxvi. 45. N.

34. *Banish from city to city, διωξετε απο πολεως εις πολιν.* E. T. *Persecute them from city to city.* That *διωκω* has both significa-

tions, cannot be doubted. But the words, in construction, commonly remove all ambiguity. *Διωκειν απο πολεως* is unquestionably to banish from, or drive out of a city. If it had been, as in ch. x. 23. where the expression is, *δταν διωκωδιν υμας εν τη πολει*, not *απο της πολεως*, it ought to have been rendered *persecute*. See note on that verse. This distinction seems not to have been attended to by modern translators.

35. *Son of Barachiah*. In the book of Chronicles, to which this passage plainly alludes, Zechariah is called son of *Jehoiada*. But no Gr. MS. extant, or ancient version of this Gospel, has *Jehoiada*. Jerom, indeed, acquaints us, that he found it so in the Heb. Gospel of the Nazarenes. But, considering the freedoms which have been taken with that Gospel, in other places, we cannot account it sufficient authority for changing a term which is supported by the amplest evidence. It is more reasonable to think, with Father Si. that though not mentioned in the O. T. *Jehoiada* must have also had the name *Barachiah*. To have two names was not then uncommon.

² *The sanctuary, του ναου*. L. i. 9. N.

36. *All shall be charged upon this generation*. As I understand it, this expression must not be interpreted as implying that those individual crimes, which happened before the time of the people then living, would be laid to their charge; but that, with every species of cruelty, oppression, and murder, which had been exemplified in former ages, they of that age would be found chargeable; inasmuch as they had permitted no kind of wickedness to be peculiar to those who had preceded them; but had carefully imitated, and even exceeded, all the most atrocious deeds of their ancestors from the beginning of the world. There is no hyperbole in the representation. The account given of them by Josephus, who was no Christian, but one of themselves, shows, in the strongest light, how justly they are here characterized by our Lord.

CHAPTER XXIV.

2. *All this ye see, ου βλεπετε παντα ταυτα*. E. T. *See ye not all these things?* The *ου* is wanting in many MSS. The Vul. Eth.

Cop. Ara. and Sax. versions have no negative particle in this place. As the expression must be read interrogatively, if we admit the negative; and affirmatively, if we reject it; the difference cannot be said to affect the sense. The composition is rather simpler without it. I have, therefore, with many modern critics, omitted it.

3. *The conclusion of this state.* Ch. xii. 32. N.

5. *Many will assume my character,* πολλοὶ ελεῖβονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου. E. T. *Many shall come in my name.* But to come in one's name signifies, with us, more properly, to come by one's authority or order, real or pretended. Thus, *Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord.* In this sense, as the Messiah came in the name of God, the Apostles came in the name of the Messiah. This is far from being the sense of the phrase in the passage under review. Here it plainly signifies, that many would usurp his title, make pretensions to his office and character, and thereby lead their followers into the most fatal delusion. That this is the sense here, is plain from what is immediately subjoined, λεγοντες, *Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ χριστος.* The expression is rendered, not badly, into Itn. by Dio. *Molti veranno sotto il mio nome;* which has been followed in Fr. by the translators of P. R. Si. Sa. and Beau. who say, *Plusieurs viendront sous mon nom;* but L. Cl. says more explicitly, *Il viendra bien des gens qui prendront mon nom.*

10. *Will be ensnared,* σκαραβαλισθησονται. Ch. v. 29. N.

15. *On holy ground,* ἐν τοπῷ ἁγίῳ. E. T. *In the holy place.* But this expression, with us, invariably denotes *the sanctuary*, or the outer part of the ναὸς, or temple, strictly so called. This is not the meaning here; neither is τοπος ἁγιος the name by which *the sanctuary* is ever distinguished in the N. T. It is called simply, το ἅγιον, or ἡ σκηνη πρωτη, or ἁγια; the inner part of the house, or most holy place, being distinguished by the appellation ἡ σκηνη δευτερα, or ἁγια ἁγιαν. Τοπος ἁγιος, therefore, denotes any place, which, comparatively, may be denominated *holy*. The whole temple, το ἱερον, including all the courts, is twice so termed in the Acts. Nay, the whole city Jerusalem, with its suburbs and environs, was *holy*, compared with other cities; and such, also, was the whole land of Judea, compared with other countries. Besides, it deserves to be remarked, that the expression here is indefinite, as it wants the article, and is, therefore, more justly, as it is more literally, render-

ed by Sc. a *holy place*, than in the common version. The place, or ground, here called *holy* is, undoubtedly, the environs of Jerusalem. Accordingly, in the parallel passage in L. we are told : *When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, know, that the desolation thereof is nigh.*

² *The desolating abomination, το βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως.* E. T. *The abomination of desolation* ; that is, when expressed in the common idiom, *the abomination which desolateth*, or maketh desolate. By *abomination*, nothing is more commonly understood, in the language of Scripture, than idols of every kind. It is here, generally, and I think, justly, supposed to refer to the Roman standards to be erected round the city, when it would be besieged by Titus Vespasian. The expressions used here, and in the parallel passages, especially when compared with the history of the siege, as related by Josephus, who, though a Jew, is the best commentator on this prophecy, add the highest probability to the interpretation now given. Those standards had images on them which were adored by the Romans. Nothing could be more properly styled a desolating abomination, as they accompanied the armies which came for the utter destruction of the place ; and as the appearance of those detested ensigns was rendered, to all who received this prophecy, a sure signal of the impending ruin.

³ (*Reader, attend !*) (*ὁ αναγινωσκων νοειτω !*) E. T. (*Whoso readeth, let him understand.*) The verb *νοειν*, signifies not only to *understand*, but to *consider*, to *mind*, to *attend*. See 2 Tim. ii. 7. In regard to the words themselves, after the strictest examination, I cannot help concluding, that they are not the words of our Lord, and consequently make no part of this memorable discourse, but the words of the Evangelist, calling the attention of his readers to a very important warning and precept of his Master, which he was then writing, and of which many of them would live to see the utility, when the completion of these predictions should begin to take place. I have, therefore, given them in the character by which I always distinguish the words of the writer. My reasons for ascribing them rather to him than to the speaker, are as follows : First, The words are too abrupt, and too much out of the syntactic order for a common parenthesis ; for if this had been a clause immediately connected with the preceding (as those must imagine who think

that *the reader*, here means the reader of Daniel's prophecy,) the *τοτε*, which follows, should have preceded; and the whole would have run thus: *Οταν ιδητε το βδελυγμα το ρηθεν δια Δανιελ,— εστις εν τοπω αγιω τοτε ο αναγιωσκων νοειτω, οτι εν τη Ιουδαια φευγετωσαν,—ο επι του δοματος μη καταβαινετω,—και ο εν τω αγρω μη επιστρεψατω*—With so small an alteration, the sentence would have been grammatical and perspicuous. As it stands, nothing can be more detached than the clause under review. At the first glance, one is apt to think that there should be a full stop at *νοειτω*. And indeed, if the latter part were entirely away, the former would make a complete sentence. It is not necessary that the second member of a sentence beginning with *οταν*, should be introduced with *τοτε*; though this adverb is sometimes used for rendering the expression more energetic. The clause, therefore, *ο αναγιωσκων νοειτω*, is here thrust in between the two constituent parts of the sentence, and properly belongs to neither. That it does not belong to the first member, is evident from the mood, as well as the want of the copulative; and it is excluded from the second, by the following *τοτε*, which, wherever it is used, ushers in all the subjunctive part of the sentence. But though it cannot be made to coalesce with our Lord's words, it appears, when understood as a call to attention from the Evangelist, extremely pertinent. Let it be observed, that our Lord pronounced this prophecy about forty years before the fulfilment of what related to Jerusalem. As this Evangelist is supposed to have written at least eight or ten years after our Lord's crucifixion, this would be about thirty years before the accomplishment. Jesus said, when he spoke this discourse, that there were of his hearers who would live to see the things happen which he had predicted; now as the time was still nearer, when the Evangelist wrote, it was natural for him to conclude, that a great proportion of his readers would be witnesses of the fatal catastrophe, and, therefore, that it was of the last importance to them to fix their attention on a warning, wherein the time is so critically marked, and on the proper use of which, not only their temporal safety, but their conviction of the truth of the Gospel, and consequently, their spiritual interest, might much depend. In this view, this apostrophe is, though short, a complete sentence, and inserted in the only proper place, between the infallible signs of immediate danger, and the conduct then to be pur-

sued. This makes the *τοτε*, which ushers in the sequel of the sentence, particularly emphatical, as serving to recal the former part. Nor is this at all unconformable to the best use in writing. Such short interruptions, as, *Now mark what follows!* or, *Would God this were duly weighed!* when suitable, serve to awaken attention, and do not suspend the sense long enough to create obscurity. Perhaps it will be said, If there be nothing unsuitable in the figure, ought we not rather to think it has been used by our Lord, than by the Evangelist? The answer is obvious. Our Lord did not write, but speak. Those who received instruction immediately from him, were not readers, but hearers. Had the expression been *ὁ ἀκούων νοεῖτω*, it must have been part of the discourse; as it is, it ought to be regarded as a call from the writer, and consequently, no part of the discourse. There is another objection. The Evangelist Mr. uses the expression exactly in the same situation. This, if it was spoken by our Lord, is no more to be wondered at, than their coincidence in any other part of the narrative: but, if it was a sentiment of the writer, that it should have struck both precisely in the same part of the narration, may appear extraordinary. That this should have happened to two writers, neither of whom knew of the writings of the other, is no doubt improbable. But that is not the case here. Mt. who was an Apostle, and an eye and ear-witness of most of the things which he relates, doubtless wrote first. That Mr. who had not the same advantages, but drew his knowledge in a great measure from the Apostles of our Lord, particularly Peter, had read with attention Mt.'s Gospel, there is no reason to doubt. And though he does not copy or follow him implicitly (for there is a considerable difference of circumstances in several parts of the narrative,) the coincidence, in many things, is so great, as could not otherwise be accounted for. And if this acquaintance with our apostle's history be admitted, it will account sufficiently for adopting a figure so apposite to the occasion.

17. *To carry things, ἀγαθὰ τι.* E. T. *To take any thing.* This is a just version of the common reading. But there is a very general consent of MSS. early editions, ecclesiastical writers, and some ancient versions, which read *τα* instead of *τι*. This reading I have after Mill and Wet. preferred.

20. *Nor on the sabbath, μηδε εν σαββατω.* E. T. *Neither on the sabbath-day.* There is no word in the original to which the term *day* corresponds. Now, as some expositors maintain, that it is the sabbatical year, and not the weekly sabbath, which is here meant; the translator ought to preserve, if possible, all the latitude of expression employed by the author.

22. *If the time were protracted, ει μη εζολοθωθησαν αι ημεραι εξειναι.* E. T. *Except those days should be shortened.* To shorten any thing, means always to make it shorter than it was; or, at least, to make it shorter than was intended. Neither of these meanings is applicable here. The like exception may be made to the Gr. verb in this place, which is used in the idiom of the synagogue. See a similar use of *μεγαλυνω* and *πλατυνω*, ch. xxiii. 5.

24. *Will perform great wonders and prodigies, δωσουσι σημεια μεγαλα και τερατα.* Wa. *will propose great signs and wonders.* No other interpreter that I know, ancient or modern, has so rendered the word *δωσουσι*. They all represent the signs or wonders, as given or shown (not proposed or promised,) to the people. This author, indeed, uses as little ceremony as Beza, in assigning his reason for this singularity, no other version, it seems, could be made to suit his doctrine of miracles. It may be so: but as the only topics which ought to weigh with a critic, are the import of the words and the scope of the passage; the question is, what meaning do these indicate? As to the first, the words *διδοναι σημεια και τερατα*, which literally represent the Heb. first occur in the Sep. in Deut. vi. 22. *Εδωκε Κυριος σημεια και τερατα, μεγαλα και πονηρα, εν Αιγυπτω.* *The Lord showed signs and wonders, great and sore, upon Egypt.* Again, in a public address to God, by the Levites, on a solemn fast; Nehem. ix. 10. *Εδωξας σημεια και τερατα εν Αιγυπτω.* *Thou showedst signs and wonders in Egypt.* Did the sacred penmen mean to tell us, that God only proposed, but did not exhibit, signs and wonders; that he threatened Egypt with plagues, but did not inflict them? I cannot suppose that even Mr. Wa. will affirm this. That *δουναι σημειον* invariably denotes to exhibit, not to promise, a miracle, might be proved by examples both from the O. T. and from the N. The only passage which this author quotes as favouring his hypothesis, is Deu. xiii. 1. &c. *If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer, who giveth thee a sign or a*

wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, &c. Is any one at a loss to discover that the sign here meant is the prediction of some event that exceeds human sagacity to foresee? Such a prediction is a miracle, which though, in fact, performed, when it is uttered, cannot be known to others as miraculous till the accomplishment. The names *prophet* and *dreamer*, serve to confirm this explanation. As to the scope of the passage in the gospel, every body sees that it is to warn the disciples against the artifices of false teachers. Now if all the art of these teachers consisted in promising great things which they never performed, it could not surely have been spoken of as enough to seduce, if possible, even the elect. To promise much and do nothing, far from fitting those impostors to be successful antagonists to men endowed with supernatural powers, did not qualify them as rivals to an ordinary juggler, who, if he have not the reality, has at least the appearance of a wonder-worker. Mere proposers or promisers are fitted for deceiving only the weakest and the most credulous of the people.

30. *Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, τότε φανησεται το σημειον του υιου του ανθρωπου εν τω ουρανω.* Gr. *σημειον*, like the La. *signum*, means not only *sign* in general, but *standard*, *banner*, which is indeed one species of sign. As the the Eng. word *ensign* is equivocal in the same way, the passage may be rendered, *Then shall the ensign of the Son of Man be displayed in heaven.* Such military ideas are not unsuitable to the prophetic style, or even to the tenor of this prophecy, which is highly figurative. But as there appears in the words a plain reference to the question put by the disciples, v. 3. *What will be the sign (το σημειον) of thy coming?* I judged it better to follow the E. T. and retain the reference. We have no reason to think that a particular phenomenon, in the sky, is here suggested. The striking evidences which would be given of the divine presence, and avenging justice, are a sufficient justification of the terms.

36. *But, of that day and that hour, Περι δε της ημερας εκεινης και της ωρας.* Bishop Newton, in his excellent work on the prophecies (Diss. XXI.) says, "It seemeth somewhat improper to say, *Of that day and hour knoweth no man*; for if the *day* was not known, certainly the *hour* was not; and it was superfluous to make

the addition ;” he therefore prefers the word *season* to *hour*. In my opinion the sentence has less the appearance of redundancy, when *ώρα* is rendered *hour*. One who says he knows the day when such a thing will be done, is understood to mean the day of the year, suppose the 7th of April ; now, if that be known, the season is known. But a man may know the *day*, who knows not the *hour* or time of the day, when a particular event shall take place.

* Three MSS. after *ουραιων* read *ουδε ο υιος*. The Eth. version has read so. Some MS. copies of the Vul. have *neque filius*, and some of the Fathers seem to have read so. But it is the general opinion of critics (and, I think, is probable) that this clause has been borrowed from the parallel place in Mr. where there is no diversity of reading.

38. *Marrying, γαμονντες και εκγαμιζοντες*. The Eng. word comprehends the sense of both the Gr. words, and therefore needs no addition.

40. *Two men.* }
41. *Two women.* } Diss. XII. P. IV. § 7, 8, 9.

Immediately after v. 41. we find, in two or three MSS. only, *εδονται δυω επι κλινης μιας*, as in L. xvii. 34. from which it has doubtless been taken.

48. *Vicious, κακος*. E. T. *evil*. ch. xxv. 26. N.

49. *Shall beat, αρξηται τυπτειν*. Mr. v. 17. N.

51. *Having discarded him, διχοτομησει αυτον*. E. T. *Shall cut him asunder*. But this ill suits with what follows of his punishment, which supposes him still alive. It is no answer to say, that the punishment of the wicked will affect both the present life and the future. Let it be remembered, that this is a parable wherein our Lord represents to us, under the conduct of earthly rulers and masters, towards their subjects and servants, in regard to the present state only, what will be the conduct of our Lord and Master in heaven, in regard to both, but principally the future. Now, to mingle thus, and confound, the letter and the spirit of the parable, or the story and the application, and to ascribe to the earthly master, the actions peculiar to the heavenly, would be as contrary to all propriety, as it is repugnant to our Lord's manner. In regard to the word

διχοτομew, we have little or no light from scriptural use. In the N. T. it occurs only here, and in the parallel passage in L. and in the Sep. it occurs only once. But it has been observed, that the Sy. uses the same word to express the sense of *διχοτομew* here, and in L. which it employs in other places for rendering *διχαζw* and *μεριζw*, *to divide, to make a breach, to separate*. Now the language spoken by our Lord was a sister-dialect of the Sy. Bishop Pearce has observed that *αποτεμνω* is used by the son of Sirach, Ecclus. xxv. 26. and *εκκοπτw* and *αποκοπτw* by the Apostle Paul, Rom. xi. 22. Gal. v. 12. in the same signification for *discarding*, cutting off from one's family or society. Nor needs there stronger evidence, especially when the absurdity implied in the other interpretation is considered, to satisfy us that this is no more than a Syriasm, to denote, he will deprive him of his office, and so cut him off from his family. Be. has therefore justly rendered it *separabit eum*, in which he has been followed by Pisc. as well as by all the Fr. translators I am acquainted with, whether they translate professedly from the Gr. or from the Vul. They all say, *le separera* ; for the Vul. which says *dividet eum*, will bear this version. All the Eng. translators of this century, except An. who says, *shall turn him out of his family*, have followed the common version.

² *With the perfidious, μετα των υποκριτων*. E. T. *With the hypocrites*. But this word with us is confined to that species of dissimulation which concerns religion only. It is not so with the Gr. term, which is commonly, and not improperly, rendered by Cas. *simulator, dissembler*. Nay, from the use of *υποκριτης*, and its conjugates, in the Sep. and in the Apocrypha, it appears to have still greater latitude of signification, and to denote sometimes what we should call an unprincipled person, one unworthy of trust. I acknowledge, that in the N. T. it commonly, not always, refers to religious dissimulation. But in a parable, whose literal sense regards secular affairs, the term ought not to be so much limited.

CHAPTER XXV.

1. *To meet the bridegroom, εις απαντησιν του νυμφιον*. Vul. *Obviam sponso et sponsæ ; to meet the bridegroom and the bride*.

The Sy. Arm. and Sax. versions have the like addition ; *και της νυμφης* is found in three MSS. of which the Cam. is one. This is no support. The internal evidence, arising from the customs, is clearly against the addition. The virgins conducted the bride, as her companions, from her father's house. The bridegroom went out, from his own house, to meet them, and to bring her home with joy and festivity.

9. *Lest there be not enough for us and you ; go rather to them who sell, and buy for yourselves, μηποτε ουκ αρκεδη ημιν και υμιν. πορευεσθε δε μαλλον προς τους πωλοντας, και αγοραβατε εανταις.* E. T. *Not so, lest there be not enough for us and you ; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.* Vul. *Ne forte non sufficiat nobis et vobis, ite potius ad vendentes, et emite vobis.* Several interpreters have thought that there is an ellipsis in the original. Our translators, who were of this number, have supplied it by the words *not so*. Elsner and others suppose, that it ought to be supplied by the word *ορατε*, or *βλεπετε*, before *μηποτε*, and therefore render the expression, *take care, lest there be not enough*. But it concerned themselves surely (not those who asked the favour) to take care, before granting it, that there should be a sufficiency for both. Such an answer as this would not be a refusal, as was plainly the case here, but a conditional grant of the request, the askers themselves being made the judges of the condition. The quotation from Acts v. 39. is nowise applicable. The supply of *ορατε* before *μηποτε και θεομαχοι ευρεθητε*, nobody can doubt to be pertinent, because it was entirely the concern of those to whom Gamaliel addressed himself, to take care that they did nothing which might imply fighting against God. It is evident, therefore, that, to make the words before us suit the sense, it would be necessary to supply *δει ημας σκοπειν*, we must take care. But an ellipsis, such as this, is unexampled in these writers. I have judged it, therefore, more reasonable to follow the authors of the Vul. who have not discovered any ellipsis in this passage. The only thing which can be considered as an objection is the *δε* in the second clause. Suffice it for answer, that this particle is wanting in the Al. Cam. and other MSS. of principal note, as well as in the Vul. and is rejected by some critics of eminence, ancient and modern. And even, were it allowed to stand, it would not be impossible to show that in some instances it is redundant.

13. To this verse there is, in the common editions, a clause annexed, which I have not translated, *εν η̄̄ ο ῡιος του ανθρωπου ερχεται*. E. T. *Wherein the Son of Man cometh*. But it is wanting in so many MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. and most of the ancient versions, as well as the early ecclesiastical writers who commented on the Gospel, that it cannot, in a consistency with the rules of criticism, be received. There is an evident defect in the next verse,

14. Which is the beginning of a new paragraph. Something (it is not said what) is compared to a man who went abroad. This defect is supplied in the common version, by these words, *The kingdom of heaven is*. In my opinion, it has been originally, *The Son of Man is*, and, from the mistake of supposing this to refer to the words preceding (for in the ancient manner of writing, they had neither points nor distances between the words,) has arisen the interpolation of some words in the 13th verse, and the want of some in the 14th. This, I acknowledge, is but conjecture, though, I think, a very probable one. At any rate, as a supply of some words must be made to v. 14th, those I have used are, at least, as well adapted to the words in connexion as any other that have been employed for the purpose.

26. *Malignant and slothful servant*, *πονηρε δουλε και οζηρε*. E. T. *Thou wicked and slothful servant*. There are several words in Gr. and indeed in all languages, which may be justly said to be nearly synonymous, but not entirely so. Of this kind especially are those epithets which relate to character, as *κακος*, *πονηρος*, *ανομος*, *αδικος*, and some others. That they are sometimes used promiscuously, there can be no doubt. And when a translator renders any of them by a general term, as *evil*, *bad*, *wicked*, he cannot be said to mistranslate them. Nay sometimes, when used without reference to a particular quality in character or conduct, they ought to be so translated. There is, nevertheless, a real difference among them: and one of them is fitted for marking, more especially, one species, or one degree, of depravity, and another for marking another. *Αδικος*, for example, in its strictest signification, is *unjust*, *ανομος*, *lawless*, *criminal*. The first relates more to a man's principles of acting, the second to his actions themselves, considered as open violations of law; *κακος*, when applied to character, answers nearly to our word *vicious*, and *πονηρος*, to *malicious*, or *malignant*; *κακος* is accord-

ingly properly opposed to *εναρετος*, *virtuous*, or *δικαιος*, *righteous*, for the former term does not occur in Scripture ; *πονηρος* to *αγαθος*, *good*. *Κακια* is *vice*, *πονηρια* *malice* or *malignity*. The use of these words in the Gospel, will be found pretty conformable to the account now given. Thus, in ch. xxiv. 48. the servant, who not only neglected his master's business, but ill-treated his fellow-servants, and rioted with debauchees, is very properly denominated, *κακος δουλος*, *a vicious servant*. The bad servant, in this parable, appears in a different light. We learn nothing of his revellings or debaucheries ; but, first, of his *sloth*, which entitles him to the epithet *οκνηρε*, and, secondly, of the *malignity* of his disposition, shown in the unprovoked abuse which, under pretence of vindicating his own conduct, he threw upon his master. The cruel and inexorable is also called *πονηρος*, ch. xx. 32. Let it be remarked also, that a *malignant*, that is, *an envious eye*, is *πονηρος*, not *κακος οφθαλμος*, that the disposition of the Pharisees to our Lord, is ch. xxii. 18. called *πονηρια*, and that the devil is commonly termed *ο πονηρος* not *ο κακος*. *Malice* is the the most distinguishing feature in his character : but *vice*, which seems more connected with human nature, is not so properly applied to an unembodied spirit. It may be said, Is not then *the evil one* too vague a translation of *ο πονηρος* ? I acknowledge it is : but have adopted it merely because it is hazardous, in a term become so common, to depart from established custom. The Gr. *ο διαβολος* does not correspond exactly to the Heb. *Satan* ; yet, as the Seventy had employed it, the penmen of the N. T. did not judge it necessary to change it. It is true, however, in general, that there is much more justness in the epithets employed in the Gospel, than is commonly attended to. Too many, in translating, seem to have no other aim, in regard to these, than when the epithet is expressive of a bad quality, to select one to answer to it, as opprobrious as the language they write, can afford them. I am far from saying, that this was the way of those to whom we owe the common version. Though sometimes the import of an original term might have been more exactly hit, they rarely fail to express themselves so as to preserve propriety with regard to the speaker. Now, it deserves to be remarked, that though our Lord, in his rebukes of the hardened offender (for it is only of such I am speaking,) often expresses himself with sharpness, it is always with justice and dignity.

In some translations, on the contrary, he is made to express himself so as we should rather call passionately. In the passage under review, one makes him begin his reply with, *Thou base and indolent slave* ; another with, *Thou vile slothful wretch*. But do we ever hear such expressions, except from one in a violent passion ? And can any body seriously imagine that it adds weight to the sentence of a judge, to suppose that he spoke it in a rage ? Our Lord spoke the language of reproof ; such interpreters make him speak the language of abuse. Allow me to add that, in his language, there is more of pointed severity than in theirs. The reason is, his words touch the particular evils ; theirs signify only evil in general, in a high degree, and are much more expressive of the resentment and contempt of the speaker, than even of the demerit of the person addressed. The terms, *base, vile, slave, wretch*, used thus, are manifestly of this sort. Like *rascal, villain, scoundrel*, they are what we properly call scurrility. To abound in appellatives of this sort, is not to be severe, but abusive. Such translators invert that fundamental rule in translating, to make their pen the organ of their author for conveying his sentiments to their readers ; they, on the contrary, make their author, and the most dignified characters recorded by him, their instruments for conveying to the world, not only their opinions, but even the asperities of their passions.

27. *With interest, ουν τοκο*. E. T. *With usury*. Anciently the import of the word *usury*, was no other than profit, whether great or small, allowed to the lender for the use of borrowed money. As this practice often gave rise to great extortion, the very name at length became odious. The consideration, that the Jews were prohibited, by their law, from taking any profit from one another for money lent (though they were allowed to take it from strangers,) contributed to increase the odium. When Christian commonwealths judged it necessary to regulate this matter by law, they gave to such profit, as does not exceed the legal, the softer name of *interest* ; since which time *usury* has come to signify solely extravagant profit disallowed by law ; and which, therefore, it is criminal in the borrower to give, and in the lender to take. As it is not this kind of profit that is here meant, the word *usury* is now become improper.

29. *From him that hath not.* Mr. iv. 24, 25. N.

² *That which he hath, ὁ εχει.* In a considerable number of MSS. but few of any note, it is ὁ δοκει εχειν. Agreeable to which is the Vul. *quod videtur habere*, also the second Sy. and the Sax. This expression has probably been borrowed by some copyist as more correct from L. viii. 18. where its genuineness cannot be questioned.

34. *From the formation of the world, απο καταβολης κοσμου.* E. T. *From the foundation of the world.* Vul. *A constitutione mundi.* Ar. *A fundamento mundi.* Er. *Ab exordio mundi.* Lu. *A primordio mundi.* Cas. *Ab orbe conditio.* Be. *A jacto mundi fundamento.* It is very uncommon to find every one of these translators adopting a different phrase, and yet, perhaps, more uncommon to find that, with so great a variety in the expression, there is no difference in the sense. If any of the abovementioned versions be more exceptionable than the rest, it is that which renders *καταβολη* *foundation*: for, first, this term, except in the sublimer sorts of poetry, is not very happily applied to the world, in which there is nothing that can be said to correspond to the foundation of a house. Secondly, the word is never used in Scripture to express that part of a house, or edifice of any kind, which we call *the foundation*: for though there is frequent mention of this part of a building, the word is never *καταβολη*, but always *θεμελιος*, or some synonymous term; and this observation holds equally of the N. T. the Sep. and the Jewish Apocryphal writings. I admitted that, in the highly figurative style of the Heb. poets, such an image as that of laying the foundation might be applied to the world. I find it in the O. T. twice applied to the earth, which is nearly the same; but it deserves our notice, that in neither of the places is the word in the Sep. *καταβολη*, or any of its derivatives. One of the passages is Ps. cii. 25. (in the Sep. ci. 26.) *Of old thou hast laid the foundation of the earth, Κατ' αρχας, την γην θεμελιωσας*; the other quite similar, Is. xlviii. 13. where the same verb is used. Thirdly, in the only place where *καταβολη* occurs in Hellenistic use, as applied to a house (which is in the Apocrypha, 2 Mac. ii. 29.), it is so far from meaning the foundation, that it denotes the whole structure as contradistinguished to the several parts. See the passage in Gr. and in the common translation, where *καταβολη* is rightly rendered *building*.

36. *Ye assisted me, επεδεψασθε με. E. T. Ye visited me.* The Eng. word *visited* does not sufficiently express the import of the Gr. verb, when the subject of discourse is a sick person, or one in distress. In such cases, *επισκεπτομαι* is strictly *visito ut open feram*. That more is meant here than a visit of friendship, for giving consolation, is probable from the expression used in the next clause, *ηλθετε προς με*, which is intended to denote such friendly visits, being often all that a Christian brother can do for prisoners. Some late translators render *επεδεψασθε με, ye took care of me*. This, I think, is in the opposite extreme, as it is hardly applicable to any, but the physician or the nurse.

CHAPTER XXVI.

3. The clause *και οι γραμματεις* is wanting in a few noted MSS. The authors of the Vul. and of some other versions, have not read it in their copies. But as it is found in the Sy. and the much greater number both of MSS. and of ancient versions, and is not unsuitable to the scope of the place, I have retained it.

* *Palace, αυλην.* Though *αυλη* strictly signifies an open court before the entry of a house or palace (see note on v. 58.), it is not uncommon to employ it by synecdoché for the palace.

5. *Not during the festival, μη εν τη εορτη. E. T. Not on the feast day.* As there is nothing in the original answering to the word *day*, the term *εορτη* may include the whole *festival*; to wit, the day of the paschal sacrifice, and the seven days of unleavened bread that followed it. As, therefore, it is not certain that one day only is spoken of, it is better to leave it in the same latitude in which we found it. *Festival* may either denote the first day, which was properly the day of celebrating the passover, or it may include all the eight days.

7. *Balsam, μυρον. E. T. Ointment.* But it is evident, from what is said here, and in other places, both in the O. T. and in the New, that their *μυρα* were not of the consistency of what we denominate *ointment*, but were in a state of fluidity like oil, though somewhat thicker.

12. *It is to embalm me, προς το ενταφιασαι με.* E. T. *For my burial.* The *προς το*, in several instances, expresses rather the intention of Providence, than the intention of the person spoken of. This circumstance is mentioned by our Lord here, with a view to suggest the nearness of his funeral. For the import of the word *ενταφιασαι*, see the note on J. xix. 40.

15. *Thirty shekels, τριακοντα αργυρια.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

16. *To deliver him up, ινα αυτον παραδω.* E. T. *To betray him.* We say a man has sold what he has concluded a bargain about, though he has not delivered it to the purchaser. In like manner, Judas *betrayed* his master to the pontiffs, when the terms were settled between them, though he did not then put them in possession of his person.

22. *Began every one of them to say, ηρξαντο λεγειν αυτω εκαστος αυτων.* Mr. v. 17. N.

26. *The loaf, τον αρτον.* E. T. *Bread.* Had it been *αρτον*, without the article, it might have been rendered either *bread*, or a *loaf*. But as it has the article, we must, if we would fully express the sense, say *the loaf*. Probably, on such occasions, *one loaf*, larger or smaller, according to the company, was part of the accustomed preparation. This practice, at least in the apostolic age, seems to have been adopted in the church, in commemorating Christ's death. To this, it is very probable, the Apostle alludes, 1 Cor. x. 17. *Οτι εις αρτος, εν σωμα οι πολλοι εσμεν οι γαρ παντες εκ του ενος αρτου μετεχομεν.* That is, *Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body; for we all partake of the one loaf.* It is in the common translation, *For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread.* Passing at present some other exceptions which might be made to this version, there is no propriety in saying *one bread*, more than in saying *one water*, or *one wine*. Ch. iv. 3. N.

² *Having given thanks, ευλογησας.* But the number of MSS. many of them of principal note, editions, fathers, &c. that read *ευχαριστησας*, is so great, as to remove every doubt of its being genuine. Mill and Wet. both receive it. Indeed it may be said to be of little consequence here which way we read, as the two words are ad-

mitted by critics to be, in this application, synonymous. Ch. xiv. 19. N.

28. *Of the new covenant, της καινης διαθηκης.* Diss. V. P. III.

29. *Of the product of the vine, εκ τουτου του γεννηματος της αμπελου.* E. T. *Of this fruit of the vine.* But the Gr. term for fruit is καρπος. The word γεννημα I have literally rendered. Besides, *The fruit of the vine* is not *wine*, but *grapes*; and we speak of *eating*, but never of *drinking, fruit*. In the phrase corresponding to this in the Heb. rituals, a term is employed that commonly signifies *fruit*. But our original is the language of the Evangelist, not that of the Rabbies. *The product* is here equivalent to *this product*; because it cannot be this individual, but this in kind, that is meant.

* *Until the day, when I shall drink it with you, in my Father's kingdom.* I confess, I do not see the difficulty which some fancy they see in these words. That the expression is figurative, will not, I believe, be denied: yet not more so than the terms *fire* and *brimstone*, as applied to the future doom of the wicked. If we have not positive evidence that there will be any thing in heaven analogous to eating and drinking, as little have we, that there will not. And there is at least no absurdity in the supposition. As far as our acquaintance with living creatures extends, means are always necessary for the support of life. That no means are requisite in heaven, (if it be a truth) is not self evident. It will hardly be pretended that it is expressly revealed; and as yet we have no experience on the subject. We know, there will be nothing analogous to marriage. Where the inhabitants are immortal, there is no need of fresh supplies. But it does not appear implausible, that the use of means for the preservation of life may constitute one distinction between the immortal existence of angels, and men, and that of him who, by way of eminence, is said (1 Tim. vi. 16.) *alone to have immortality*. Difficulties in scripture arise often from a contradiction, neither to reason, nor to experience; but to the presumptions we have rashly taken up, in matters whereof we have no knowledge.

30. *After the hymn, ύμνησαντες.* E. T. *When they had sung an hymn.* But ύμνω may be either *I sing*, or *I recite a hymn*. In the latter way it has been understood by the author of the Vul. and by Ar. who render it, *Et hymno dicto*. Cas. to the same purpose,

Deinde dictis laudibus. But Er. Zu. Be. Pisc. and Cal. *Quum hymnum cecinissent.* All the modern translations I have seen, except Lu.'s, and such as are made from the Vul. follow these last ; the Sy. is equally ambiguous with the original, and so are most of the Oriental versions, and the M. G. As it is evident, however, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation, I have followed neither, but used an expression of equal latitude with the original. I have chosen to say *the hymn*, rather than *a hymn* ; as it is a known fact, that particular Psalms, namely, the cxiv. and four following, were regularly used after the paschal supper.

31. *I shall prove a stumbling-stone to you all, παντες, υμεις σκανδαλισθησεσθε εν εμοι.* E. T. *All ye shall be offended because of me.* The word *snares* answers equally well with *stumbling-stone* for conveying the sentiment ; (Ch. v. 29. N.) yet as there may be here an allusion to the passage in the Psalms (so often quoted in the N. T.) representing our Lord as a select and chief corner-stone which to many would prove a stone of stumbling, *πετρα σκανδαλον*, I have been induced to prefer a closer interpretation in this place.

38. *My soul is overwhelmed with a deadly anguish, περιλυπος εστιν η ψυχη μου εως θανατου.* E. T. *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.* But this expression, *unto death*, is rather indefinite, and seems to imply a sorrow that would continue till death ; whereas, the import of the original is, such a sorrow as is sufficient to cause death, that is, *deadly*. Cas. has expressed the sense thus, *In tanto sum animi dolore ut emoriar.* The last clause sufficiently explains *εως θανατου*.

39. *Not as I would, but as thou wilt, ουχ ως εγω θελω, αλλ' ως συ.* E. T. *Not as I will, but as thou wilt.* As the Heb. has no subjunctive or potential mood, the indicative, in conformity to the Oriental idiom, is frequently used by the penmen of the N. T. in the sense of the subjunctive. Our Lord's *will*, in effect, perfectly coincided with his Father's ; because it was his supreme desire, that his Father should be obeyed, rather than that any inclination of his own should be gratified. The first clause, therefore, ought to express, not what was in reality, as matters stood, but what would have been, his desire, on the supposition that his Father's will did not interfere. This

is properly expressed by L. Cl. *Non comme je le voudrois, mais comme tu le veux*, which is the way I have adopted.

45. *Sleep on now, and take your rest, καθευδετε το λοιπον, και αναπνευθε.* Some late interpreters translate this with an interrogation, thus, *Do ye still sleep on, and take your rest?* This appears, at first, to suit better the words which follow, *Arise, let us be going.* I cannot, however, help favouring the more common, which is also the more ancient, translation. The phrase *το λοιπον*, and simply, *λοιπον*, when it relates to time, seems always to denote the future. There are only three other places in Scripture, where it has clearly a relation to time, and in regard to these there can be no doubt. The first is Acts xxvii. 20. *Λοιπον περιηρηετο πασα ελπις του σωζεσθαι ημας* E. T. *All hope that we should be saved was then taken away.* The version would have been still better if closer, and instead of *then*, it had been said *thenceforth.* It is rendered by Cas. *Cætera spes omnis salutis nostræ sublata erat.* 2 Tim. iv. 8. where it is rendered by our translators *henceforth*, and Heb. x. 13. where it is rendered *from henceforth.* There is reason, therefore, here to retain the common version; nor is there any inconsistency between this order, which contains an ironical reproof, very natural in those circumstances, and the exhortation which follows, *Arise.* Ch. xxiii. 32. N.

² *Of sinners, αμαρτωλων.* The Gr. word expresses more here than is implied in the Eng. term. Our Lord thereby signified, that he was to be consigned to *the heathen*, whom the Jews called, by way of eminence, *αμαρτωλοι*, because *idolaters.* See Gal. ii. 15. For a similar reason they were also called *ανομοι*, *lawless*, *impious*, as destitute of the law of God. The expression *δια χειρων ανομων* (Acts ii. 23.), ought therefore to be rendered, not as in the E. T. *by wicked hands*, but *by the hands of the wicked*, or rather *impious.*

47. *Clubs, ξυλων.* L. xxii. 52. ² N.

50. *Friend, εταιρε.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 11.

52. *Whoever hath recourse to the sword*—a proverbial expression not to be rigidly interpreted. Such sayings are understood to suggest what frequently, not what always, happens. It seems to have been introduced at this time, in order to signify to the disciples that

such weapons as swords were not those by which the Messiah's cause was to be defended.

55. *A robber, ληστην.* E. T. *A thief.* Diss. XI. P. II. § 6.

58. *The court of the high priest's house, της αυλης του αρχιερωσ.* E. T. *The high priest's palace.* From v. 69. as well as from what we are told in the other Gospels, it is evident that Peter was only in the court without, which, though enclosed on all sides, was open above, nor was it any-wise extraordinary to kindle a fire in such a place. L. xxii. 55. N.

² *Officers, υπηρεταισ.* E. T. *Servants.* Υπηρεται, means, commonly, servants of the public, or official servants of those in authority, the officers of a judicatory.

59. *And the elders, και οι πρεσβυτεροι.* This clause is wanting in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions, and in two or three MSS. It is not wanting in the Sax. which makes it probable that the Itc. read as we do.

60. *But though many false witnesses appeared, they found it not, και ουχ' ευρον, και πολλων ψευδομαρτυρων προσελθοντων ουχ' ευρον.* The repetition of ουχ' ευρον, in the common copies, is very unlike the manner of this writer. In the Vul. Sy. Cop. Ara. and Sax. the phrase is found only once. It is not repeated in the Com. nor in some ancient MSS. As it makes no addition to the sense, and does not perfectly agree with the strain of the narrative, I have followed the example of some of the best ancient translators, in avoiding the repetition.

63. *I adjure thee, εξορκιζω σε.* This appears to have been the Jewish manner of administering an oath. The Heb. *עשהב* *hish-biang*, which in the O. T. is commonly, by our interpreters, rendered, *to make one swear*, is justly translated by the Seventy, *ορκιζω*, or *εξορκιζω*. The name of the deity sworn by was subjoined, sometimes with, sometimes without, a preposition. Thus, Gen. xxiv. 3. where we have an account of the oath administered by Abraham to his steward, which is rendered in the Eng. Bible, *I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth*, is thus expressed in the Sep. *εξορκιζω σε Κυριον τον Θεον του ουρανου και της γης* : *I adjure thee by Jehovah, the God of heaven and earth.* After such adjuration, by a magistrate or lawful superior, the answer returned by the person adjured, was an answer upon

oath : a false answer was perjury ; and even the silence of the person adjured was not deemed innocent. Many examples of this use of the simple verb ὀρκίζω, which is of the same import with the compound, may be discovered by consulting Trommius' Concordance. Mr. v. 7. N.

64. *At the right hand of the Almighty, ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως.* E. T. *On the right hand of power.* The Heb. word הַגְּבוּרָה *hageburah, power, or might, in the abstract, that is, omnipotence, or supreme power, was become, with Jewish writers, a common appellation for God. As the abstract, here, does not suit the idiom of our tongue, and as, in meaning, it is equivalent to our word, the Almighty, I have used this term in the translation. The Vul. says Virtutis Dei.*

65. *Blasphemy.* Diss. X. P. II.

68. *Divine to us, προφητεῖσόν ἡμῖν.* E. T. *Prophecy unto us.* But the Eng. verb, to prophesy, always denotes to foretell what is future : here a declaration is required concerning what was past. The verb, *to divine*, is applicable to either, as it denotes, simply, to declare any truth not discoverable by the natural powers of man. From the Evangelists Mr. and L. we learn that our Lord was at this time blindfolded.

71. *Said to them, This man too was there, λέγει τοῖς ἐκεῖ. Καὶ οὗτος ἦν.* E. T. *Said unto them that were there, This fellow was also.* But a very great number of MSS. amongst which are some of the most ancient, read λέγει αὐτοῖς. Ἐκεῖ καὶ οὗτος ἦν. The Sy. and Go. have read so. It is in the Com. and Ald. editions. It is supported by Origen and Chr. and preferred by Gro. Mill and Wetstein. I might add that, in the common reading, the adv. ἐκεῖ. is absurdly superfluous ; for, who can imagine that she addressed herself to those who were not there ?

CHAPTER XXVII.

2. *The procurator.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 17.

5. *Strangled himself, ἀπηγξαστο.* E. T. *Hanged himself.* The Gr. word plainly denotes *strangling* ; but does not say how, by hanging, or otherwise. It is quite a different term that is used in

those place where *hanging* is mentioned. It may be rendered, *was strangled*, or *was suffocated*. I have, in the above version, followed the Sy. The common translation follows the Vul. which says, *laqueo se suspendit*. Wa. *was choked with grief*. This interpreter does not deny that *strangled* expresses the common meaning of the Gr. word in classical authors. The examples he produces in support of his version, serve only to show that, in a few obscure instances, the word *may* (not *must*) have the signification which he assigns to it. There are only two examples wherein it occurs in the Sep. One is 2 Sam. xvii. 23. where it is applied to Alithopel, in which he does not seem to question the justness of the common version: the other is Tob. iii. 10. where it is spoken of Sara the daughter of Raguel. This passage, that interpreter thinks, clearly confirms (and I think, it clearly confutes) his version. That the daughter's suicide would bring dishonour on the father may be understood by any body; but her dying of grief, in consequence of the bad treatment she received from strangers, might be to a parent a subject of affliction, but could not be a matter of reproach.

6. *The sacred treasury, τον κοθραν*. E.T. *The treasury*. The word, in the original, occurs in no other passage in Scripture. Josephus makes use of it, and interprets it, *τον ιερον θησαυρον*. It is formed from *κοθραν*, originally Heb. which also occurs but once in the Gr. form, Mr. vii. 11. and signifies that which is given or *devoted to God*. The unlawfulness of putting the thirty shekels into this repository, arose from this single circumstance, that it contained the treasure consecrated to God.

8. *That field is called the field of blood, ελληθη ο αγρος εκινος αγρος αιματος*. Vul. *Vocatus est ager ille Haceldama, hoc est ager sanguinis*. To the words, *Haceldama, hoc est*, as there is nothing that corresponds in any MS. or translation, except the Sax. and as they are quite superfluous, there can be no doubt that they are an interpolation from Acts i. 19. With insertions of this kind, the Latins have been thought, even by some of their own critics, more chargeable than the Greeks.

9. *Jeremiah*. The words here quoted are not in any prophecy of Jeremiah extant. But they bear a strong resemblance to the words of Zechariah, xi. 12, 13. One MS. not of great account,

has Ζεχαριου. Another adds no name to προφητου. There is none added in the first Sy. version. And it would seem, from a remark of Augustine, that some copies, in his time, named no Prophet. But as all the other MSS. now extant, even those of the greatest antiquity, the Vul. and the other ancient versions, the Sy. alone excepted, all the earliest ecclesiastical writers, read just as we do, in the common editions, I did not think a deviation from these could be denominated other than an emendation merely conjectural.

9, 10. “*The thirty shekels, the price at which he was valued, I took, as the Lord appointed me, from the sons of Israel, who gave them for the potter’s field.*” Ελαβον τα τριακοντα αργυρια την τιμην του τετιμημενου, ον ετιμησαντο, απο υιων Ισραελ: και εδωξαν αυτα εις τον αγρον του κεραμεως, καθα συνεταξε μοι ο Κυριος. E.T. *They took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued; whom they of the children of Israel did value, and gave them for the potter’s field, as the Lord appointed me.* Ελαβον may be either the first person singular, or the third person plural. The latter hypothesis has been adopted by the Vul. and the majority of translators, ancient and modern. The former has been preferred by the Sy. and the Per. translators. There can be no doubt, that their way of rendering gives more perspicuity, as well as more grammatical congruity, to the sentence. As the words stand in most versions, they appear to represent the action of one, as the obedience of an appointment given to another. Thus: *They took the silver pieces, and gave them—as the Lord appointed [not them, but] me.* This incongruity, and the obscurity arising from it, are entirely removed by the other interpretation, which has also this advantage, that it is more conformable to the expression of Zechariah referred to, ελαβον τους τριακοντα αργυρους. So it runs in the Sep. Now there is no ambiguity in the Heb. verb, as there is in the Gr. The former cannot be rendered, but by the first person singular. This would certainly have determined all translators to prefer this manner, as being at once more conformable to Syntax, to common sense, and to the import of the passage, to which the allusion is made. But there arose a difficulty from the verb εδωξαν, which appears to be coupled, in construction, with ελαβον. Now, on the supposition that it was so construed, as εδωξαν could be no other

than the third person plural, *ελαβον* must be so too. In one of the copies, called Evangelistaries (which are MSS. of the Gospels, divided according to the manner of reading them in some church or churches,) it is *εδωκα*, in the first person singular. The Sy. interpreter seems also to have read *εδωκα*, in the copy or copies used by him. But this is too slight an authority, in my opinion, for deserting the common reading. I, therefore, entirely approve the ingenious solution that has been given by Knatchbull, and read *εδωξαν* in the third person plural, not as coupled by the conjunction with *ελαβον*, but as belonging to a separate clause; in which case, the version will be literally as follows: *I took the thirty shekels (the price of him that was valued, whom they valued) from the sons of Israel (and they gave them for the potter's field,) as the Lord appointed me.* The version given in the text, is the same in meaning, but more perspicuously expressed. Here, indeed, the words, *and they*, supply the place of the relative *who*, a very common Hebraism. It is surely much less usual, though I will not say unexampled, to make, as our translators do, the phrase *απο υιων Ισραελ*, serve as a nominative to the verb *ετιμησαντο*.

11. *Thou art the King of the Jews?* *Συ ει ο βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων*; E. T. *Art thou the King of the Jews?* Vul. Ar. Er. Cal. *Tu es rex Judæorum?* There can be no doubt that this is an interrogation; but it is equally certain, that the form of the expression is such as admits us to understand it either as an affirmation, or as an interrogation. Now, I imagine, it is this particularity, in the form of the question, which has given rise to the customary affirmative answer, *συ λεγεις*, wherein the answerer, without mistaking the other's meaning, expresses his assent to the words, considered in the simple form, as an assertion; and this assent serves equally as an answer to the question. But this would not be a natural manner of answering, if the form of the question were such as could not admit being interpreted otherwise than as a question. In that case, nothing can, with any propriety, be said to have been advanced by the asker. As sometimes, with us, a question is put derisively, in the form of an assertion, when the proposer conceives, as seems to have happened here, some absurdity in the thing; I thought it best, after the example of so many Lat. interpreters, to adopt the equivocal, or

rather the oblique, form of the original expression. The ambiguity is not real, but apparent. The accent in speaking, and the point of interrogation in writing, do, in such cases, sufficiently mark the difference. Dio. has also adopted this method, and said, *Tu sei il re de' Judei?* All the other modern versions I have seen, follow Be. Pisc. and Cas. who put the question in the direct form, the two former saying, *Tune es*—the other, *Esne tu*—Leo de Juda says, *Es tu*—

17, 18, 19, 20, 21. The reader will observe, that there is, in these verses, in the common version, some appearance both of tautology and of incoherency, which, in my opinion, is entirely removed, by including the 18th and 19th in a parenthesis, and understanding the 21st as a resumption, after this interruption, of what had been mentioned in the 17th verse. Let the whole passage in the original be carefully examined, and compared with the common version, and with this.

24. *Of this innocent person, του δικαίου τουτου.* E. T. *Of this just person.* Cas. *Hujus innocentis.* L. Cl. *De cet innocent.* The forensic sense (as I may call it) of the Heb. word צדִיק *tsadick*, and consequently of the Gr. *δικαιος*, adopted as equivalent, is no more than *innocent*, or *not guilty*, of the crime whereof he stands accused. This appears from many places of the O. T. which relate to judicial proceedings, particularly Deut. xxv. 1. and Prov. xvii. 15. where it is contrasted with a word commonly rendered *wicked*, and which, in its forensic meaning, denotes no more than *guilty* of the crime charged. Pilate does not appear to have known any thing of our Lord's character, and therefore could pronounce nothing positively. But he could not fail to see, that this accusation brought before him, sprang from malice, and was unsupported by evidence.

29. *Of thorns, εξ ακανθων.* Bishop Pearce has remarked, in a note on this verse, that *ακανθων* may be the genitive plural, either of *ακανθα*, *thorn*, or of *ακανθος*, the herb called *bear's-foot*, a smooth plant, and without prickles. But in support of the common version let it be observed, first, that in both Mr. and J. it is called *στεφανος ακανθινος*. This adjective, both in sacred use, and in classical, plainly denotes *spineus*, *thorny*; that it ever means made of *bear's*

foot, I have seen no evidence. Thus in the Sep. (Is. xxxiv. 13.) in the common editions, the phrase *ακανθίνα ξύλα*, is used for prickly shrubs. 2dly, That the word *ακανθα*, thorn, both in the right case, and in the oblique cases, occurs in several places of the N. T. and of the Sep. is unquestionable. But that, in either, the word *ακανθος* is found (leaving this, and the parallel passage in J. about which the doubt is raised, out of the question,) has not been pretended. 3dly, Not one of the ancient, or of the Oriental, versions, or, indeed, of any versions known to me, favours this hypothesis. The Itc. and Sy. which are the oldest, both render the word *thorns*. The silence of ecclesiastical writers, for near two centuries, if this can be properly pleaded, after what has been observed of the ancient Itc. and Sy. interpreters, and especially, when we consider how few of the works of the earliest Fathers are extant, proves nothing at all. That Tertullian, the first of the Lat. Fathers, mentions the crown as being of thorns, and speaks in such a manner as clearly shows that he had never heard of any different opinion, or even doubt raised upon the subject, is very strong evidence for the common translation. Add to this, that an eminent Gr. Father, Clement of Alexandria, a contemporary of Tertullian, understood the word in the same manner. "It is absurd," says he (Pæd. l. 2. c. 8.), "in us, who hear that our Lord was crowned with thorns, *ακανθαις*, to insult the venerable sufferer, by crowning ourselves with flowers." Several passages equally apposite, might be given from the same chapter, but not one word that betrays a suspicion that the term might be, or a suggestion that it ever had been, otherwise interpreted. There is, therefore, here the highest probability, opposed to mere conjecture.

34. *Vinegar*, *οξος*. Vul. *vinum*. With this agree the Cop. Arm. Sax. 2d Sy. and Eth. versions. The Cam. and a few other MSS. read *οινον*.

* *Wormwood*, *χολης*. E. T. *Gall*. The word *χολη* is used with great latitude in the Sep. The Heb. word signifying *wormwood*, is twice so rendered, Prov. v. 4. Lam. iii. 15. At other times it seems to denote any bitter or poisonous infusion, that tasted like gall. To give such a beverage to criminals before their execution, was then used, in order to make them insensible of the horrors of death.

35. [*Thus verifying the words of the prophet, "They shared my mantle among them, and cast lots for my vesture,"*] ἵνα πληρωθῆ το ρηθεν ὑπο του προφητου· Διμερισαντο τα ἱματια μου ἑαυτοις, και επι τον ἱματισμον μου, εβαλον ζληρον. These words are wanting in a very great number of MSS. in which the most valuable are included, in the works of some ancient commentators, in several early versions and editions. Though the Vul. in the common editions, has this clause, it is not found in many of their best MSS. As it was a practice, with some transcribers, to correct, and, as they imagined, improve, one Gospel by another, it is extremely probable, that this clause has been, at first, copied out of J. to whose Gospel it properly belongs. For this reason I have marked it, as of doubtful authority.

40. The reproach in this verse is introduced in the Vul. by the interjection, *Vah!* in which concur the Cop. Sax. and 2d. Sy. The Cam. and another. MS. read *Ova*.

40. 43. *God's Son*. See note on ch. iv. 3. and on v. 54. of this chapter.

41. *And the Pharisees*. The words *και φαρισαιων*, though not in the common edition, are found in a very great number of MSS. some of which are of principal note. They are in the Cam. and some of the oldest editions. With these agree the Ara. and both the Sy. versions. Origen and The. have read so. They are approved by Wet. and other moderns.

42. *Cannot he save himself?* ἑαυτον ου δυναται σωσαι ; E. T. *Himself he cannot save*. The words may be understood, either as an affirmation, or as a question. I think, with Bishop Pearce, that the latter way is better suited to the context, as well as more emphatical.

45. *The whole land*, *πασαν την γην*. The word *γη* is equivocal, and may be rendered either *earth* or *land*. Some have thought, that the addition of *πασα*, ought to determine our preference in favour of the most extensive signification of the word ; but this argument is not conclusive. No two expressions can be more similar than *εγενετο λιμος επι πασαν την γην*, L. iv. 25. and Mt.'s expression here, *εγενετο σκοτος επι πασαν την γην*. Without some special reason, therefore, nothing could be more capricious than to

render the former. *There was famine throughout all the land ;* and the latter, *There was darkness over all the earth.*

46. *Eli, eli, lama sabachthani.* It is to be observed, that these are not the very words of the Heb. original of the psalm quoted : but they are in what is called Syrochaldaic, at that time the language of the country, the dialect which our Lord seems always to have used. It is not entirely the same with the language of the Sy. version, but very near it. The only difference, in this exclamation, between the Psalm and the Gospel, is that, in the latter, we have *sabachthani* where, in the former, we have *ghazabthani*. The Sy. interpreter has not, as all other interpreters, given first the very words of our Lord on this occasion, and then an interpretation of them in the language he was writing ; but, by a very small alteration on some of the words, he has made them suit the dialect of his version, so as to need no other interpretation. In Sy. they run thus *Eil, cil, lamana sabachthani ?* Yet, even here, one would suspect a different reading ; *Eil* signifies *God*, not *my God*. The reader will perceive that the difference in sound is inconsiderable. See the Preface to this Gospel, § 19. and Mr. xv. 34. N.

47. *Some of the bystanders said, " He calleth Elijah."* These must have been some of the strangers, of whom there was always a great concourse at the passover, who did not understand the dialect then spoken in Jerusalem.

50. *Resigned his spirit, αφηκε το πνευμα.* E. T. *Yielded up the ghost.* This is exactly agreeable to the sense, though the phrase is somewhat antiquated. Dod. *Dismissed his spirit.* He thinks, after Jerom, that there was something miraculous in our Lord's death, and supposes it to have been the immediate effect of his own volition. Whether this was the case or not, the words here used give no support to the hypothesis. The phrase *αφιεναι την ψυχην*, which is very similar, is used by the Seventy, Gen. xxxv. 18. speaking of Rachel's death. The like expressions often occur in Josephus, and other Gr. writers. Nay, an example has been produced from Euripides, of this very phrase, *αφηκε πνευμα* for *expired*. Indeed the primitive meaning of the word *πνευμα* is *breath*, from *πνεω* I *breathe*. In this sense it occurs Gen. vi. 17. 15. 2 Sam. xxii. 16. Ps. xviii. 15. xxxiii. 6. and many other places.

51. *The veil of the temple.* Probably the inner veil, which divided the *holy* from the *most holy* place.

54. *The son of a god, θεου υιος.* E. T. *The Son of God.* Let it be observed, that the phrase, here, is neither *ὁ υιος του θεου, the son of God*, nor *υιος του θεου, a son of God*; but it is *υιος θεου*, both words being used indefinitely, *a son of a God*; an expression perfectly suitable in the mouth of a polytheist, like the Roman centurion. The reason of my using the definitive article before the word *son*, is, because it is more conformable to our idiom. If the father be expressed indefinitely, though the definite article be prefixed to *son*, it has no emphasis in Eng. Thus, should one say, of a person enquired about, He is *the son of a merchant*, nobody would understand, as implied in this answer, that he is either *the only son*, or *the eldest*. Yet this mode of answering is more common than to say, He is a son of a merchant. But when the father is mentioned by his proper name, or distinguished by his office from every other person, we use the indefinite article before the word *son*, when we mean to express no more than the relation. Thus: *He is a son of the Lord Chancellor*, or *of Mr. Such-a-one*. Likewise, in deducing a genealogy, the definite article is frequently used before *son*, without any meaning. Thus, we may say: *Judah the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham*. The usual Fr. idiom is in this, preferable, which is now also adopted in Eng. They use no article, definite or indefinite, in such cases, but say *Juda fils de Jacob, fils d'Isaac, fils d'Abraham*. So much for anomalies, in the use of articles that obtain amongst ourselves. Yet nothing would be more unjust than to conclude, from this, that our articles have no distinctive import, but are used promiscuously, and capriciously. Let us not, then, fall into the like fallacy, in arguing about the articles of other languages, because of a few exceptions which, to us, may appear capricious. I know it may be objected to what is advanced above, concerning the Gr. article, that in this ch. v. 43. the words *θεου υιος* occur without any article, where the term *θεου* must nevertheless be understood definitely. But, when a phrase, expressed fully, comes soon to be repeated; articles, and other definitives, such as pronouns and epithets, are, for brevity's sake, often omitted. In v. 43. there is an implied reference to what was expressed more fully, *υιος του θεου*, v. 40.; the same strain of scoffing is continued through the whole. Instances of such omissions, in the

like cases, are very numerous. I admit, also, in regard to substantives in general, that the article is sometimes omitted, when the meaning is definite, but hardly ever added when it is indefinite. I am not certain, whether *υιος*, in the two verses now referred to, should be rendered *a son*, or *the son*. Plausible reasons may be advanced for each. I have avoided the decision, by rendering it in both verses, *God's son*, which may mean either. This, as I signified before, is the method I choose to take, in cases which appear doubtful. But if the words in connexion be ever sufficient to remove all doubt, they are sufficient in v. 54. That the expression in question came from one who, as he believed a plurality of gods, could scarcely have spoken otherwise than indefinitely, is perfectly decisive. Let it be observed, further, that the same indefinite expression is used in the parallel place, Mr. xv. 39. See ch. iv. 3. N. ch. xiv. 33. N. Mr. i. 1. N.

56. *Mary Magdalene*, *Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνη*. It might be rendered, more literally, and even properly, *Mary the Magdalene*, or *Mary of Magdala*, in the same way as *Ιησους ο Ναζαρητιος* is *Jesus the Nazarene*, or *Jesus of Nazareth*. There can be no doubt that this addition, employed for distinguishing her from others of the same name, is formed from *Magdala*, the name of a city mentioned ch. xv. 39. probably the place of her birth, or at least of her residence. The appellation, *Magdalene*, stands now, however, so much on the footing of a proper name, that any the smallest change would look like an affectation of accuracy in things of no moment.

61. *The other Mary*, *ἡ ἄλλη Μαρια*. Sc. *Another Mary*. But this last version is agreeable, neither to the letter, nor to the sense, of the original. I should not have taken notice of it, were it not to show how grossly the import of the articles is sometimes mistaken, and how strangely they are confounded. This learned writer, in his notes, after mentioning the common version, *the other Mary*, adds, "This might be proper, if there were but two Marys," I answer, it is sufficient to the present purpose, that there were but two Marys, whom the Evangelist had mentioned a very little before, to wit, at v. 56. These were *Mary Magdalene*, and *Mary the mother of James and Joscs*. He now again names *Mary Magdalene*,

adding, *and the other Mary*. Can any person, who reflects, be at a loss to discover, that he says *the other*, to save the repetition of *the mother of James and Joses*? In order to evince the redundancy, not to say, insignificancy, of the Gr. articles, this author produces two other examples, which, doubtless, have appeared to him the most convincing. The first is, Mt. x. 23. Ὅταν διωκῶσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φευγετε εἰς τὴν ἀλλήν, which I have rendered, *When they persecute you in one city, flee to another*; but which is, in the common version, *When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another*. Now, to me, this passage, so far from showing the Evangelist's negligence, in his manner of using the articles, proves his accuracy. If he had expressed the first clause indefinitely, ὅταν διωκῶσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν μιᾷ πόλει, and added, φευγετε εἰς τὴν ἀλλήν, this writer's reasoning would have been just; nor could there have been a clearer evidence, that the articles were sometimes used without any determinate meaning. But as the first clause was expressed definitely, propriety required that the second should be definite also. Εἰς τὴν ἀλλήν, therefore, in this place, is equivalent to εἰς τὴν ἐκείνην, and opposed to ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. Since our translators, therefore, rendered the first clause, *When they persecute you in this city*, they ought to have rendered the second, *flee into that*, or, *into that other*: for this is one of those instances (and there are several, as has been often remarked by grammarians) wherein the article has the force of a pronoun. I have chosen, in this translation, to express the whole indefinitely, as this manner suits better the genius of our tongue, and is equally expressive of the sense. The other way, in a language wherein it flows naturally and easily, does not, I acknowledge want its advantages in point of vivacity. But to begin in one manner, and end in the other, offends alike against propriety and elegance. The other example, taken from J. xviii. 15. I should admit without a moment's hesitation, to be clearly in favour of Dr. Sc.'s doctrine, if I did not consider it as an erroneous reading. See note on that verse.

63. *Within three days*, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας. Ch. ii. 16. ³ N.

64. *Command that the sepulchre be guarded*. This, as being a servile work, it might be thought, they would not ask to be done

on the Sabbath. But we ought to reflect, that they asked this of Romans, whom they did not consider as bound by the law of the Sabbath. Jews, to this day, do not scruple to avail themselves of the work done by Christians on the Sabbath. See the note on v. 65.

65. *Ye have a guard.* Some have thought that the guard, here meant, was the Levites, who kept watch in the temple (L. xxii. 52. N.); others, that it was a band of Roman soldiers who, during the great festivals, guarded the porches of the outer court, and had it in charge to quell any tumult which might arise there, or in the city. Of this guard extraordinary, at their public solemnities, mention is made by Josephus (Antiq. l. viii. c. iv.) That it was not the Levites, the ordinary temple watch, who are here alluded to, appears from the following reasons: 1st, The service of that watch does not seem to have extended beyond the walls of the temple. 2dly, If their assistance had been judged necessary, the chief priests had no occasion to recur to Pilate for obtaining it, as, by the constitution, they who served in the temple were under the sole direction of the priests. 3dly, As the day, on which the assault seems to have been dreaded, was the Sabbath, it is probable that they would choose to have Romans soldiers, whom they could lawfully employ, and who would be restrained by no religious scruple, rather than Jews, for suppressing any tumult on that day. 4thly, Had the guard been Levites, they were accountable only to the chief priests; whereas, being Romans, they needed the priests, as mediators with Pilate, before they could be induced, by a sum of money, to propagate a falsehood, which reflected so much on themselves as military men, and even exposed them to punishment. Lastly, the name *ζουστωδία*, here given them, which is neither Gr. nor Sy. but a La. word, shows clearly they were *Romans*. It may be objected, 'But, in that case, would the procurator have said, ye have a guard, thus representing the Roman soldiers as under their authority?' I take this to be no more than a civil way of granting their request. As, in modern language, we should say, 'The guard is at your service.'

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1. *Sabbath being over*, *οψε σαββατων*. E. T. *In the end of the Sabbath*. This could be spoken only of Saturday evening; for the Sabbath ended at sun-set. That this is not the meaning here is manifest from what follows, which shows it to have been the dawn on Sunday. *Οψε* before a genitive often means *after*. Besides, in the Jewish idiom, *the evening* is understood to include the whole night, from sunset to sunrise.

2. *There had been a great earthquake*, *σεισμος εγενετο μεγας*. Pearce after Markland says, "rather *commotion*, i. e. in the air." Wa. *disturbance*. Though it is acknowledged that *σεισμος* signifies not only *earthquake*, but sometimes *tempest, whirlwind*;—the first is the common acceptation, from which we ought not to depart, unless when the words in connexion require it. This is certainly not the case here. Markland imagines that the word *εσεισθησαν*, applied to the guards, v. 4. was intended by Mt. to prevent men's mistaking the import of the word *σεισμος*, v. 2. If this was the Evangelist's intention in using that verb, he has not been lucky in the choice of an expedient, for *σεισμος* here, till of late, appears to have been understood by all interpreters for *earthquake*.

² *From the entrance*, *απο της θυρας*. These words are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

9. *When they were gone*, *ως δε επορευοντο*. E. T. *And as they went*. Dod. and Wy. *As they were going*. If, in Hellenistic use, accuracy were observed in regard to the verbs, the last would be the only proper way of rendering the expression. But from the very different nature of the Oriental tongues, there has arisen, among Jewish writers, an indefinite application of the Gr. tenses and moods, which renders them, in some cases, not a little equivocal. The expression employed, Acts xx. 18. *ως δε παρεγενοντο προς αυτον*, is extremely similar to that under review; yet no Eng. interpreter has scrupled to render it *When they were come*, (not *coming*) *to him*, as this is a meaning to which the words connected evidently confine it. Now, as the words are susceptible of this interpretation, candour

seems equally to require it, when it is essential to the consistency of the sacred historians.

² This whole clause, *ὡς δε επορευοντο απαγγελαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου*, is wanting in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. Ara and Sax. versions. It is wanting also in the Cam. and many other MSS. Chr. appears not to have read it. It is rejected by Mill and some other modern critics. Beside these, one or two MSS. which retain *ὡς δε επορευοντο*, omit *απαγγελαι τοις μαθηταις αυτου*, which are also the concluding words of the former sentence. As the latter clause, when retained, makes not the smallest alteration in the sense, I thought the above authorities might be held reason sufficient for passing it.

³ *Rejoice, χαριετε*. E. T. *All hail*. The term *hail*, in saluting rarely occurs now, except in Scripture and poetry. However, as, in some cases, we have no word which can properly supply its place, as it is very well understood, and by Scriptural use, as well as antiquity, rendered respectable, it ought not, in a translation of the Gospels, to be entirely laid aside; at the same time, it must be owned, that when the salutation stands alone, as in this passage, or is not accompanied with some compellation to the persons saluted, its appearance is rather awkward. Our translators have been so sensible of this, as to judge it necessary to insert the word *all*, to render the expression fuller. But even with this addition it still sounds oddly, and has been rarely copied by later translators, some of whom have preferred the way of circumlocution. *I salute you*, says one. Cold and formal. *God save you*, says another, which seems to imply some impending danger. To me, the literal translation of the Gr. word appears, in point of propriety, as well as simplicity, preferable to any of these methods.

14. *If this come to the procurator's ears; εαν αζουθθη τουτο επι του ηγεμονος*. Wo. and Wa. *If this come to a hearing before the governor: that is, to a judicial trial*. That this is the meaning appears to me highly improbable. In such a public inquiry, it is not easy to conceive how the chief priests and elders could interfere, without betraying themselves and risking every thing. But nothing can be more likely than their promising to use their secret influence with the procurator, to induce him, (in case he should hear the report,) to overlook it, and thus prevent examination altogether;

a promise which, doubtless, they have faithfully kept, as it entirely accorded with what they accounted their interest. Dr. Symonds discovers a vulgarity in the phrase, of which I am not sensible. If sound, according to the modern theory, be produced by an undulation of air striking the auditory nerve, we may say, I think, without a figure, that *a rumour has come to our ears*. That ingenious writer has not scrupled to say, (page 3.) *If we cast our eyes upon the period*. Now this expression is, in my judgment, much more exceptionable than the other. There is a real motion from the sonorous object to the ear; but the eyes are never cast upon this object. I may as well speak of casting my ears upon a sounding object, to denote—I listen to it.

17. *Threw themselves prostrate*, προβεβυνησαν. Ch. ii. 2. ² N.

19, 20. *Convert all the nations—teaching them*, μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη—διδασκοντες αυτους. E. T. *Teach all nations—teaching them*. Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Be. Cal. Pisc. *Docete omnes gentes—docentes eos*. Cas. employs the same verb, though in a different form; instead of *Euntes docete*, saying, after his manner, *Vadite doctum—docentes eos*. The Sy. has preserved the distinction very properly. There are manifestly three things which our Lord here distinctly enjoins his Apostles to execute with regard to the nations, to wit, μαθητευειν, βαπτιζειν, διδασκειν, that is, to convert them to the faith, to initiate the converts into the church by baptism, and to instruct the baptised in all the duties of the Christian life. Our translators have, after the whole current of La. interpreters, confounded the first and the last, rendering both words by the same Eng. word *teach*. The foreign translators have not been so implicit followers. Dio. says, *Anmastrate tutti le genti—insegnando loro*. G. F. *Endoctrinez toutes nations—les enseignants*. L. Cl. *Faites des disciples parmi toutes les nations—apprenez leur*. Beau. with whom Si. agrees, has not expressed, with the same distinctness, the two parts of the charge; for though the terms he employs are different, they are nearly synonymous, *Enseignez toutes les nations—leur apprenant*. P. R. and Sa. though they translate from the Vul. where the error originated, have distinguished them better, *Instruisez tous les peuples—leur apprenant*. The like variety is to be found in our late Eng. versions, none of which has followed here the common translation. An. Hey. and Wor. say,

Instruct all nations. Dod. *Proselyte all nations.* Wy. *Make disciples in all nations.* Wa. *Make disciples of all the nations.* Sc. and Wes. *Disciple all nations.* They all render the beginning of the 20th. v. *Teaching them.* The first of these, *Instruct all nations*, is certainly too vague and indefinite. If *to instruct* and *to teach* be not here entirely synonymous, their significations are so nearly coincident, that were they, in these two verses, to change places, it would not make a sensible difference on the meaning. Wy. in saying *Make disciples*, has hit exactly the sense of μαθητευω, but it is one thing *to make disciples in all nations*, and another thing *to make all nations disciples.* Wa. does better in this respect. Sc. and Wes. intended well, but there is no such verb as *to disciple* in the language. It is found, indeed, in Spencer, who affected obsolete words; but he uses it in a very different sense; for with him it is *to punish*, or to treat with severe discipline. The version which Dod. has given of this passage appears the least exceptionable. But the verb *to proselyte*, though sometimes occurring, is so far from being in common use, and has so much the appearance of a learned or technical term, that, in a style so natural and familiar as that of the Evangelists, we ought not, without necessity, to recur to it. But there can be no necessity here, as the verb *to convert*, applied as in this passage, has precisely the same meaning. See the note on ch. xviii. 3.

² *The conclusion of this state, της συντελειας του αιωνος.* Ch. xii. 32. N.

³ The *amen*, with which this Gospel concludes, is wanting in four MSS. and in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY MARK.

For the title, see the note on the title of the preceding Gospel.

CHAPTER I.

1. *The beginning of the Gospel.* Some consider *αρχη* here as the nominative to the verb *εγειετο*, v. 4. and include the quotations from the Prophets, verses 2d and 3d, in a parenthesis. But abstracting from the awkwardness of so long a suspension of the sense in the very first sentence, the expression *αρχη του ευαγγελιου εγειετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων*, appears nowise agreeable to the style of the sacred writers; nor will it be found to answer better, if we invert the order, and say with Markland, *Ιωαννης βαπτιζων εγειετο αρχη του ευαγγελιου* whereas, *εγειετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων*, *John came baptising*, or simply, *John baptised*, is quite in their idiom. See ch. ix. 7. L. ix. 35. The first verse, therefore, ought to be understood as a sentence by itself. It was not unusual with authors to prefix to their performance a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately follows. See Hos. i. 1, 2. In this manner also Herodotus introduces his history, *Ἡροδοτου Ἀλικαρνασσοῦς ἱστορίας ἀποδείξει ἡδε*. This usage, probably, gave rise to the custom afterwards adopted by transcribers, of putting, at the head of their transcript, *incipit*, followed by the name of the book or subject, and subjoining at the foot, *explicit*, with the name repeated, as a testimony to the reader, that the work was entire. This purpose it was, with them, the better fitted for answering, as the whole book was commonly written on one large and continued scroll, hence called a volume, and not, as with us, on a num-

ber of distinct leaves. So far, however, the custom obtains still, that we always prefix a short title on the page where we begin, and subjoin *The end*, on the page where the work is concluded.

² *Son of God*, υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. As brevity is often studied in titles, the article before υἱοῦ is probably, on that account, left out. Let it be noted, in general, that the omission of the article in Gr. is not like the insertion of the indefinite article in Eng. a positive expression that the word is to be understood indefinitely. The phrase υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, as was hinted before (Mt. xxvii. 54. N). exactly corresponds to the Eng. *Son of God*, which leaves the reader at liberty to understand *son* definitely, or indefinitely, as he thinks proper. The term *God's Son* answers the same purpose; but though well adapted to the familiarity of dialogue, it does not always suit the dignity of historical narration. Mt. xiv. 33. N.

2. *In the prophets*, ἐν τοῖς προφηταῖς. Such is the common reading. But it ought not to be dissembled, that six MSS. two of them of considerable note, some ancient versions, amongst which are the Vul. and the Sy. and several ecclesiastical writers read, *in the prophet Isaiah*. As the common reading, however, has an immense majority of copies in its favour, and some noted translations, such as the Ara. and the Eth. as it is more conformable to the scope of the place, where two quotations are brought from different prophets, and the nearest is not from Isaiah, but from Malachi, I could discover no good reason for departing from the received reading.

² *Angel*. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 9, &c.

3. *In the wilderness*, ἐν τῇ ἐρημῷ. It is called, in Mt. iii. 1. *the wilderness of Judea*, which is mentioned Jud. i. 16. and in the title of Ps. lxiii. It lay east from Jerusalem, along the Jordan, and the lake *Asphaltites*, also called *the Dead Sea*. By *wilderness* in Scripture, it is plain that we are not always to understand, what is commonly denominated so with us, a region either uninhabitable or uninhabited. Often no more was denoted by it than a country fitter for pasture than for agriculture, mountainous, woody, and but thinly inhabited. Thus, Jer. xxiii. 10. E. T. *The pleasant places of the wilderness are dried up*. Sep. *Ἐξηρανθήσονται αἱ νομοὶ τῆς ἐρημοῦ*. Houbigant. *Pascua deserti aruerunt*. Literally—*The pastures of the wilderness are parched*. Lightfoot has well observed, that these

ερημοι did not want their towns and villages. What is called (L. i. 39.) *την ορεινην*, the *hill-country*, where Mary visited her cousin Elizabeth, is included (v. 80.) in *ταις ερημοις*, the *deserts*, where the baptist continued from his birth, till he made himself known to Israel. In the similitude of the lost sheep, what is in Mt. xviii. 12. *Will he not leave the ninety-nine upon the mountains?* *επι τα ορη* is in L. xv. 4. *Doth not leave the ninety-nine in the desert*, *εν τη ερημω*. The man who had the legion is said (Mr. v. 5.) to reside *εν τοις ορεσι*, and (L. viii. 29.) to have been driven by the demon *εις τας ερημους*. I do not say, however, that the words were equivalent. Every untilled country they called *ερημος*, but every *ερημος* they did not call *ορεινη*. The principal difference between the *ερημος* and the rest of Judea, was that the one was pasturage and the other arable. In the arable, the property of individuals was separated by hedges, or some other fence; in the pasturage, the ground belonged in common to the inhabitants of the adjoining city, or village, and so needed no fences. The word *ερημος* in scripture, admits a threefold application. One is, to what is with us called *wilderness*, ground equally unfit for tillage and pasture, such as the deserts of Arabia. When used in this sense, it is generally for distinction's sake, attended with some epithet or description, as *howling*, *terrible*, or *wherein is no water*; it is sometimes used for *low* pasture-lands; sometimes for *hilly*. In this application, it oft-est occurs in the gospel, where it appears to be nearly of the same import with our word *highlands*.

4. *Publishing*. Diss. VI. P. V.—² *Reformation*. Ib. P. III.

10. *The Spirit descend upon him*, *το πνευμα καταβαινον επι αυτον*. Vul. *Spiritum descendentem et manentem in ipso*. So also the Sax. Agreeably to this, we find, in four Gr. MSS. of little account, *και μενον* inserted, which is all the authority now known.

11. *In whom*, *εν ω*. The Cam. and several other MSS. have *εν σοι*. Vul. *in te*. So also Sy. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm.

13. *Forty days*, *ημερας τεσσαρακοντα*. The Vul. adds, *et quadraginta noctibus*. Three Gr. MSS. have *και νυκτας τεσσαρακοντα*. Conformable to which are also the Ara. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions.

14. *Good tidings.* Diss. V. P. II.—²*Reign.* Ib. P. I.

15. *The time is accomplished, ὅτι πεπληρωται ὁ καιρος.* E. T. *The time is fulfilled.* The time here spoken of is that which, according to the predictions of the prophets, was to intervene between any period assigned by them, and the appearance of the Messiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as consisting of what, in prophetic language, is denominated seventy weeks, that is (every week being seven years) four hundred and ninety years; reckoning from the order issued to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. However much the Jews misunderstood many of the other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary personage; what concerned both the time and the place of his first appearance, seems to have been pretty well apprehended by the bulk of the nation. From the N. T. as well as from the other accounts of that period still extant, it is evident that the expectation of this great deliverer was then general among them. It is a point of some consequence to the cause of Christianity, that both the time and the place of our Lord's birth coincided with the interpretations then commonly given of the prophecies, by the Jews themselves, his contemporaries.

19. *Mending, καταρτιζοντας.* The Gr. word *καταρτιζειν* not only signifies *to mend* or *refit*, but also *to prepare, to make*. Interpreters have generally preferred here the first signification. This concurrence itself, where the choice is indifferent, is a good ground of preference to later interpreters. But I do not think the choice in this passage indifferent. A fishing bark, such as Josephus describes those on this lake to have been (lib. ii. ca. 43. *De Bello*), though an improper place for manufacturing nets in, might be commodious enough for repairing small injuries sustained in using.

24. *Art thou come to destroy us?* Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) observes, that the Jews had a tradition that the Messiah would destroy Galilee, and disperse the Galileans. He thinks, therefore, that this ought to be considered as spoken by the man, who was a Galilean, and not by the demon, as it is commonly understood.

² *The holy One of God.* Diss. VI. P. IV. L. iv. 34. N.

28. *Through all the region of Galilee, εις ὀλην την περιχωρον της Γαλιλαιας.* E. T. *Throughout all the region round about Gal-*

ilee. Vul. *In omnem regionem Galilææ*. This version of the old La. interpreter entirely expresses the sense, and is every way better than that given by Be. *In totam regionem circumjacentem Galilææ*, who has been imitated by other translators, both in La. and in modern languages, often through a silly attempt at expressing the etymology of the Gr. words. Had Galilee been the name of a town, *περιχωρος* must no doubt have meant the *environs*, or circumjacent country. But as Galilee is the name of a considerable extent of country, the compound *περιχωρος* denotes no more than the simple *χωρος*, or, if there be a difference, it only adds a suggestion that the country spoken of is extensive. But as *the region round about Galilee* must be different from *Galilee* itself, or, which is the same thing, *the region of Galilee*, the translators that render it so, totally alter the sense. The use of *περιχωρος* in the Sep. manifestly supports the interpretation which, after the Vul. and all the ancient interpreters, I have given. *Ἡ περιχωρος Αργοβ* is, in our bible, *the region of Argob*; *ἡ περιχωρος του Ιορδανου*, *the plain of Jordan*. Other examples might be given, if it were necessary. To express properly in Gr. *the region round about Galilee*, we should say, *ἡ περιχωρος*, not *της Γαλιλαιας*, but *περι την Γαλιλαιαν* the repetition of the preposition being quite agreeable to the genius of the tongue. Thus, Apoc. xv. 6. *Περιεξωμενοι περι τα στήθη*. There is no occasion, therefore, for Dr. Pearce's correction, "rather into the whole region of Galilee, which was round about, *i. e.* about Capernaum;" a comment which is, besides, liable to this other objection, that, if the lake of Gennesaret was, as is commonly supposed, the boundary of Galilee on the east, it would not be true that Capernaum, which was situated on the side of the lake, was surrounded by Galilee.

38. *The neighbouring boroughs, τας εχουμενας κωμοπολεις*. The Cam. *εγγυς πολεις και εις τας κωμας*. Vul. *proximos vicos et civitates*. So also Sy. Go. Sax. and Ara. The reading of a single MS. can have no weight in this case. And the versions have a very little. The uncommonness of the word *κωμοπολεις*, which occurs not in the Sept. and no where else in the N. T. might naturally lead translators to resolve it into *κωμας και πολεις*. But, as it is understood to denote something intermediate, greater than the one and less than the other, the sense is sufficiently expressed by the Eng. word *boroughs*.

43. *Strictly charging him*, εμβριμηθαμενος αυτω. Mt. ix 30. ¹N.

44. *To the priest*, τω ιερει. Vul. *Principi sacerdotum*. Two ordinary Gr. MSS. have τω αρχιερει. The Sax. also follows the Vul. This is all the collateral evidence which has been produced for the reading of the Vul. Wet. adds the Go. version. But if I can trust to the Go. and Anglo-Saxon versions, published by Junius and Mareschal, Amsterdam 1684, the Go. is here entirely agreeable to the common Gr. Indeed there is every kind of evidence, external and internal, against this reading of the Vul. The power of judging in all such cases belonged by law equally to every priest. The addition of the article τω, in this passage, appears to have arisen from this circumstance, that, during the attendance of every course, each priest of the course had his special business assigned him by lot. One, in particular, would have it in charge to inspect the leprous and unclean, and to give orders with regard to their cleansing. For this reason it is said *the priest*, not *a priest*; but we have reason to think that, except in extraordinary cases, *the high priest* would not be called upon to decide in a matter which the law had put in the power of the meanest of the order. The Sy. uses the plural number, *to the priests*.

CHAPTER II.

2. *The word of God*, τον λογον. L. i. 2. N.

7. *Blasphemies*. Diss. X. P. II. § 14.

8. *Jesus knowing in himself*, επιγνους ο Ιησους τω πνευματι αυτου. E. T. *When Jesus perceived in his Spirit*. There is something particular in the expression of the Evangelist. At first, it would appear applicable only to the perception a man has of what passes within his own mind, when the object of his thought is his own faculties and their operations. This species of knowledge we commonly distinguish by the name *consciousness*. But this is far from suiting the application of the phrase here, where the thing perceived was what passed in the minds of others. To me it appears manifest, that the intention of the sacred writer was to signify that our Lord, in this case, did not, as others, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and outward methods of discovery, which are open to all men,

but from peculiar powers he possessed, independently of every thing external. I have, therefore, preferred to every other, the simple expression *knowing in himself*; both because *perceiving in*, or *by*, *his Spirit*, has some ambiguity in it, and because the phrases *ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ* and *το πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ* often, in the Jewish idiom, denote *himself*. May it not be reasonably concluded, that the information as to the source of this knowledge in Jesus, is here given, by the sacred writer, to teach all Christians, to the end of the world, that they are not to think themselves warranted; by the example of their Lord, to pronounce on what passes within the hearts of others, inasmuch as this is a branch of knowledge which was peculiar to the Son of God, whose special prerogative it was, not to need that any should testify concerning man unto him, as of himself he knew what was in man. J. ii. 25.

15. *Placed themselves at table.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—7.

17. [*To reformation,*] *εἰς μετανοίαν.* This clause is wanting here in a greater number of MSS. and ancient versions than in Mt. ix. 13. (See note 3d on that verse.) It is rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. It is not improbable that it has originally, by some copyist who has thought the expression defective without it, been borrowed from L. v. 32. about which there is no diversity of reading. But though there may be some ground to doubt of its authenticity in this place, and in that above quoted from Mt. yet, as there can be no doubt of its appositeness, I thought it better to retain it in both places, and distinguish it as of doubtful authority.

18. *Those of the Pharisees, οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων.* In a considerable number of MSS. (some very valuable) we read *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.* The Vul. has *Pharisæi*, not *discipuli Pharisæorum.* This is also the reading of the Cop. Go. Sax. and second Sy. versions. But they are not all a sufficient counterpoise to the evidence we have for the common reading.

19. *The bridemen, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος.* E. T. *The children of the bride-chamber.* It is evident that the Gr. phrase *υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*, denotes no more than the Eng. word *bridemen* does, namely the young men who, at a marriage, are attendants on the bride and

bridegroom ; whereas, the phrase in Eng. *the children of the bride-chamber*, suggests a very different idea.

² *Do they fast?* μη δυναται νηστεειν ; E. T. *Can they fast?* a subject such as this, relating to the ordinary manners or customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of any thing, which is never done, as of what cannot be done : because it cannot, with propriety, or without the ridicule of singularity, be done. Μη δυναται νηστεειν is therefore synonymous with μη νηστεουσι ; *Do they fast?* And ου δυναται νηστεειν, with ου νηστεουσι, *They do not fast.* As the simple manner suits better the idiom of our tongue, I have preferred it.

20. *They will fast, νηστεουσιν.* E. T. *Shall they fast?* The expression here used does not convey a command from our Lord to his disciples, but is merely a declaration made by him occasionally to others, of what would in fact happen, or what a sense of propriety, on a change of circumstances, would induce his disciples, of themselves, to do. The import is therefore better expressed by *will* than by *shall*. At the time when the common translation was made the use of these auxiliary verbs did not entirely coincide with the present use. In the solemn style, and especially in all prophecies and predictions, *shall* was constantly used where every body, now speaking in prose, would say *will*. As that manner is (except in Scotland) become obsolete ; and as, on many occasions, the modern use serves better the purpose of perspicuity, distinguishing mere declarations from commands, promises, and threats ; I judged it better, in all such cases, to employ these terms according to the idiom which prevails at present.

24. *Which, on the Sabbath, it is unlawful to do.* Mt. xii. 2. N.

26. *Abiathar the high priest.* From the passage in the history referred to, it appears that Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, was then the high priest.

² *The tabernacle—the loaves of the presence.* Mt. xii. 4. N.

28. *Therefore, the Son of Man, ωστε ο υιος του ανθρωπου.* This is introduced as a consequence from what had been advanced, v. 27. *The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.* Hence one would conclude, that, *the Son of Man*, in this verse, must be

equivalent to *man*, in the preceding ; otherwise a term is introduced into the conclusion, which was not in the premises.

CHAPTER III.

4. *To do good—or to do evil ; to save, or to kill—*αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι ψυχην σωσαι, η αποκτειναι. In the style of Scripture, the mere negation of any thing is often expressed by the affirmation of the contrary. Thus, L. xiv. 26. *not to love*, or even to love less, is called *to hate* ; Mt. xi. 25. *not to reveal*, is *to hide* ; and here, *not to do good*, when we can, is *to do evil* ; *not to save*, is *to kill*. Without observing this particularity in the Oriental idiom (of which many more examples might be brought,) we should be at a loss to discover the pertinency of our Lord's argument ; as the question about preference here was solely between *doing* and *not doing*. But from this, and many other passages, it may be justly deduced, as a standing principle of the Christian ethics, that not to do the good which we have the opportunity and power to do, is, in a certain degree, the same as to do the contrary evil ; and not to prevent mischief, when we can, the same as to commit it.

5. *For the blindness of their minds*, επι τη πωρωσει της καρδιας αυτων. Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

12. *He strictly charged them*, πολλα επιτιμα αυτοις. Ch. ix. 25. N.

14. *That he might commission them to proclaim the reign*, ινα αποστειλλη αυτους κηρυσσειν. Diss. VI. P. V. § 2.

21. *His kinsmen hearing this, went out*, ακουσαντες οι παρ' αυτου εξηλθον. Sir Norton Knatchbull, a learned man, but a hardy critic, explains these words as if they were arranged and pointed thus, 'Οι ακουσαντες παρ' αυτου εξηλθον, " Qui audiverunt, sive audientes quod turba ita fureret, ab eo exiverunt." *They who heard went out from him*. He does not plead any diversity of reading, but that such transpositions of the article are often to be met with. " Ακουσαντες οι dicitur frequenti traiectione pro οι ακουσαντες." But it would have been more satisfactory to produce examples. For my part, I cannot help thinking, with Raphelius, that this transposition is very harsh, and but ill-suited to the idiom of the language.

‘Οι παρ’ αὐτοῦ. That this is a common phrase for denoting, *sui, propinqui, cognati*, his kinsmen, his friends, is well known. I have preferred the word *kinsmen*, as the circumstances of the story evince, that it is not his disciples who are meant, but who would most readily be understood by the appellation *friends*. Bishop Pearce is of a different opinion, and thinks that by ‘οι παρ’ αὐτοῦ is meant, “rather those who were with him, or about him, that is some of the Apostles or others present.” Of the same opinion is Dr. M’Knight. But I cannot find a warrant for this interpretation. *Παρα* often signifies *ad, apud, juxta, prope; at, near, with;* but not when joined with the genitive. It has, in that signification, regularly the dative of persons, and the accusative of things. Thus, Phavorinus, *Παρα προθεσις, ὅτε πλησιοτητα δηλοι, επι μεν εμψυχου, δοτικη συντασσεται επι δε αψυχου, αιτιατικη.* He subjoins only three exceptions that have occurred to him, in all which the preposition has the accusative of the person, instead of the dative, but not a single example wherein it is construed with the genitive. The use of the preposition, in the N. T. in this signification, which is very frequent, I have found, except in one instance, where the dative of the thing, and not the accusative, is used, entirely conformable to the remark of the lexicographer. The instance is in J. xix. 25. *Ειστηκεισαν δε παρα τω σταυρω.* But in no instance have I found it with a genitive, unless when the meaning is different; when it has either no relation to place, as appears to be the case here, or when it corresponds to the La. *a, ab*, and to the Eng. *from*. If the article did not form an insuperable objection to the disposition of the words proposed by Knatchbull, his way of rendering *παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐξηλθον, went out from him*, would be unexceptionable. Another insuperable objection against both the above hypotheses (for both imply that it was some of the disciples, or at least some of those who were with Jesus in the house, that went out,) is that, by the Evangelist’s account, they who went out were persons who had been informed of his situation by others. *Ακουσαντες οὖν παρ’ αὐτοῦ.* Now, what writer of common sense would speak of men’s hearing of a distress which they had seen and felt, and in which they had been partakers? For it is said, not of him alone, but of him and his disciples, that they were so crowded, that they could not so much as eat. Nor can the participle *ακουσαντες;* in

a consistency with the ordinary rules of construction, refer to any thing but the distress mentioned in the preceding verse.

³ *To lay hold on him, κρατησαί αυτον.* All the above mentioned critics agree in thinking that the *αυτον* refers not to *Ιησου*, but to *οχλος*, in the twentieth verse. L. Cl. also, has adopted this opinion. He renders the words *κρατησαι αυτον* pour *la retenir*, referring to *la multitude*, in the foregoing verse. As to the justness of this version, far from being dogmatical, he says, modestly enough in his notes, *Les mots κρατησαι αυτον, sont equivoques, et peuvent être également rapportez au mot οχλος qui precede, et à Jesus Christ. Si l'on suit cette construction, l' Evangeliste, voudra dire &c. mais si on rapporte ces paroles à Jesus Christ, il leur faudra donner un sens conforme*—He seems to put both ways of rendering the words on a foot of equality. Bishop Pearce is more positive, and says, in his note on this passage, our Eng. translation must certainly be a mistake. Why? Because Jesus was in a house, and therefore they who wanted to lay hold on him, could not go out for that purpose. True, they could not go out of that house; but if they who heard of his distress were in another house (and the very expression employed by the Evangelist, shows that they were not witnesses of the distress,) would there be any impropriety in saying, *They went out to lay hold on him?* I admit, with L. Cl. that the pronoun *αυτον*, may refer either to *οχλος*, or to Jesus, the subject of discourse. But that the latter is the antecedent here, is the more probable of the two suppositions, for this reason: the same pronoun occurs before, in this verse, where it is admitted, by every body to refer to *him*, and not to the *multitude*, *οι παρ αυτου εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον.* The interpretation, therefore, which makes it refer to *him*, though not absolutely necessary, is the most obvious, and the most conformable to the syntactic order. Further, till of late, the pronoun here has been invariably understood so by interpreters. Thus, the Vul. *Cum audissent sui, exierunt tenere eum.* It must have been *eam*, if they had understood it of the crowd, *turba*, mentioned in the preceding sentence. With this agree, in sense, all the other translations I know, ancient or modern, Oriental or European, L. Cl.'s alone excepted. The ancient commentators, Gr. and La. show not only that they understood the expression in the same way, but that they never heard of any other interpretation. Though, in matters of abstract reasoning, I am far from paying great deference

to names and authorities, their judgment is often justly held decisive in matters purely grammatical.

⁴ *He is beside himself*, ἐξεστῆ. Vul. *In furorem versus est*. It shocks many persons to think, that so harsh, so indecent, a sentence concerning our Lord should have been pronounced by his relations. Several methods have, accordingly, been attempted, for eluding this sentiment entirely, or at least affixing another meaning to the word ἐξεστῆ, than that here given, though the most ancient and the most common. By the explanation Dr. Pearce had given of the preceding words (which I have assigned my reasons for rejecting,) he has avoided the difficulty altogether; what is affirmed being understood, by him, as spoken of the crowd, and not of Jesus. But he has not adverted, that to give the words this turn, is to render the whole passage incoherent. Nothing appears plainer, than that the verdict of his friends, in this verse, is the occasion of introducing the verdict of the Scribes in that immediately following. Observe the parallelism (if I may be allowed the term) of the expressions: 'Οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξηλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτον, ελεγον γαρ' οτι ἐξεστῆ και' οἱ γραμματεῖς' οἱ ἀπο' Ἱεροσολυμων καταθαντες ελεγον οτι Βεελζεβουλ εχει. Were the Scribes also speaking of the crowd? As that will not be pretended; to suppose that in one verse the crowd is spoken of, and in the next our Lord, though the expression is similar, and no hint given of the change of the subject, is, to say the least, a very arbitrary supposition. Now, that the sense given in the common version, which I have followed, is an ordinary meaning of the word, is not denied. Phavorinus explains it by *μαινεται*, and in 2 Cor. v. 13. it is contrasted with the verb *σωφρονειν*, in such a manner as not to admit another interpretation. Thus: *Εἴτε γαρ ἐξεστημεν, θεω εἴτε σωφρονουμεν, ὑμιν*. It is urged, on the other side, that the word occurs in the Sep. in a different meaning, Gen. xlv. 26. *ἐξεστῆ ἡ διανοια Ιακωβ*. E. T. *Jacob's heart fainted*. But passing the observation, that the expression is not entirely the same, I should admit the same to be the meaning of the Evangelist, if it were mentioned as what was reported to his friends, and not as what was said by them. When they say, *he is beside himself*, every body understands it as a conclusion which they infer, on the sudden, from what they had heard. The judgment is rash and injurious, but not unnatural to people in a certain temper. The other version, *he has*

fainted, denoting a visible event, could not naturally come from those who knew nothing of what had happened, but by information from others. If it had been said, in the future *εξοστησεται*, *he will faint*, the case had been different, as this would have been no more than an expression of their fears. L. Cl. was so sensible of the weight of the above mentioned objections, that though he considered the pronoun *αυτον* as relating to the crowd, he could not understand *οτι εξεστη*, which he renders *qu'il etoit tombé en defaillance*, as either spoken of the crowd, or as spoken by the friends: but, in order to keep clear of both these difficulties, he has, after Gro. adopted an hypothesis which, if possible, is still more exceptionable. He supposes, in contradiction to all appearances, that the word *ελεγον*, in this verse, is used impersonally or indefinitely, and that the same word, in the next verse, so similarly introduced, is used personally or definitely. Accordingly, he translates *ελεγον γαρ*, not *car ils disoient*, as the construction of the words requires, but *car on disoit*, thus making it not what his kinsmen inferred, but what was reported to them. If this had actually been the case, the simple, obvious, and proper, expression, in Gr. would have been: *Ακουσαντες οὐ παρ' αυτου οτι εξεστηκει, εξηλθον κρατησαι αυτον*. In this case, also, I should have thought it not improbable that the word implied no more than those writers suppose, namely, that he had fainted. Some are for rendering it, *he wondered*, or *was amazed*, assigning to it the same meaning which the word has ch. ii. 12. where an evident subject of wonder and amazement is first mentioned, and then the passion, as the natural effect. This way of rendering the words is exposed to objections equally strong, and more obvious. The only modern Eng. versions, that I know, which follow the common translation, are Hey. and Wes. Gro. thinks that the Sy. and Ara. favour his explanation of the word *εξεστη*. But father Si. is of a different opinion. I cannot help observing, on the whole, that in the way the verse is here rendered, no signification is assigned to the words, which it is not universally allowed they frequently bear; no force is put upon the construction, but every thing interpreted in the manner which would most readily occur to a reader of common understanding, who, without any preconceived opinion, entered on the study. On the contrary, there is none of the other interpretations which does not (as has been shown) offer some violence

to the words, or to the syntax ; in consequence of which, the sense extracted, is far from being that which would most readily present itself to an unprejudiced reader. It hardly admits a doubt, that the only thing which has hindered the universal concurrence of translators, in the common version, is the unfavourable light it puts our Lord's relations in. But that their disposition was, at least, not always favourable to his claims, we have the best authority for asserting. See J. vii. 5. with the context.

I shall conclude this long critique on the whole passage, with taking notice of a different reading on the first part of it. The Cam. (with which concur two versions, the Go. and the Cop.) substitutes *ὅτε ηκουσαν περι αυτου οι γραμματαις και οι λοιποι*, when the Scribes and the rest heard concerning him, for *ακουσαντες οι παρ αυτου*. Had this reading been sufficiently supported (which is far from being the case,) I should have gladly adopted it, and saved the relations.

27. *The strong one's house.* L. xi. 21. N.

29. *Eternal punishment.* Ch. xii. 40. N.

CHAPTER IV.

10. *Those who were about him, with the twelve, asked him, ηρωτησαν αυτον οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα.* Vul. *Interrogaverunt eum hi qui cum eo erant duodecim.* With this agrees the Sax. In conformity to the import, though not to the letter, of this reading, four Gr. MSS. of which the Cam. is one, instead of *οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα*, read *οι μαθηται αυτου*. This is all the countenance which the reading adopted by the Vul. has from antiquity.

24. *To you who are attentive, υμιν τοις ακουουσιν.* E. T. *Unto you that hear.* The places are numberless, wherein the Heb. *שמעו shamang*, and the Gr. *ακουειν*, signify not barely *to hear*, but *to be attentive*, to show regard to what one hears. See, amongst other passages, Mt. xviii. 15, 16. That it must be understood with this limitation here, is evident from its being preceded by the warning, *βλεπετε τι ακουετε*, and from its being followed by the words, *ος γαρ αν εχη*—where the phrases, *to have*, and *not to have*, are, on all sides, allowed to mean, in the first instance, to make, and not to

make, a good use of what one has ; and, in the second, barely to possess, and not to possess. It may be proper to add, that in some noted MSS. the words *τοις ακουουδιν* are wanting ; as well as in the Vul. Cop. and Ara. versions.

25. *From him who hath not, even that which he hath, shall be taken.* See the preceding N. *That which he hath*, in the last clause, is what he is possessed of. I did not think it proper to interpret the word differently, according to its different senses, because there is, here, an intended paronomasia. Mt. x. 39. N.

36. *Having him in the bark, they set sail, παραλαμβανουσιν αυτον, ως ην εν τω πλοιω.* E. T. *They took him, even as he was, in the ship.* Vul. *Assumunt eum ita ut erat in navi.* The word *ita, even*, has not any thing in the original corresponding to it, and does not serve to illustrate the sense. With the Vul. agree most modern versions. L. Cl. indeed says, *Ils le prirent dans leur barque*, but has overlooked the *ως ην* entirely. Raphelius seems to understand the passage in the same way that L. Cl. does, and explains *ως ην*, with such preparation as he had, putting the comma after *ην*, and not after *αυτον*. With Elsner, I approve more the common interpretation. Against the other there are three principal objections : 1st. The words are not *εις το πλοιον*, but *εν τω πλοιω*. 2dly, No example of *ως ην*, in their acceptation, has been yet produced. To give, as an example, *ωδπερ ξυνεσχευασμενος ην*, is too ridiculous to require an answer. Nor is it more to the purpose, to quote phrases so different as *ως ειχεν* and *ως* and *ετυχεν*. 3dly, It does not suit the humble manner in which our Lord travelled at all times. He never affected the state of a great man ; nor do we ever hear of servants, horses, or waggons, attending him with provisions. Dr. Pearce, who seems to favour that way of rendering the words, was sensible of this incongruity, and therefore explains it, *tired as he was* ; but this still supposes such an ellipsis in the expression as I can find no example of.

39. *Commanded the wind.* Ch. ix. 25. N.

CHAPTER V.

1. *Gadarenes, Γαδαρηνων.* Vul. *Gerasenorum.* Mt. viii. 28. N.

3. *In the tombs, εν τοις μνημειοις.* In a very great number of MSS. amongst which are all the oldest and the best, it is *εν τοις*

μνημασι. The Com. and Ben. read so. This is one of those diversities concerning which, as the sense is not affected, we can conclude nothing from translations. I agree with Mill and Wet. in adopting it, and have, therefore, though of little consequence, rendered it *tombs*, as I commonly use *monument* in translating μνημειον.

7. *I conjure thee, όρσιζω σε. E. T. I adjure thee.* It was observed, on Mt. xxvi. 63. that the verbs όρσιζειν and εξορσιζειν, when spoken of as used by magistrates, or those in authority, denote to *adjure*; that is, to oblige to swear, to exact an oath; but when it is mentioned as used by others, and on ordinary occasions, it is better rendered to *conjure*, or to obtest solemnly.

11. *The mountain, τα ορη.* There is so great a concurrence of the most valuable MSS. early editions, Fathers, and ancient versions, in favour of τω ορει, in the singular, that it is hardly possible to question its authenticity. The ancient translations which corroborate this reading, are all those that are of any account with critics, the Vul. both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. the Cop. the Sax. and the Eth. Gro. Mill, and Wet. receive it.

15. *Him who had been possessed by the legion, τον δαιμονιζομενον—τον εδχηκοτα τον λεγεωνα.* The latter clause is not in the Cam. and one other MS. and seems not to have been read by the author of the Vul. who says, *Illum qui a daemónio vexabatur.* Neither is it in the Sax.

17. *They entreated him to leave their territories, ηρξαντο παρακαλειν αυτον απελθειν απο των οριων αυτων. E. T. They began to pray him to depart out of their coasts.* It has been long observed by critics, that αρχομαι in scripture, before an infinitive, is often no more than an expletive, αρχομαι λεγειν for λεγω, &c. That this is sometimes the case, cannot be doubted, but as, in my judgment, it does not hold so frequently, as some imagine, I shall make a few observations for ascertaining the cases in which that verb is significant, and ought to be translated. The 1st. is, when an adverb of time appears to refer us to the special circumstance expressed by αρχομαι. Thus Mt. iv. 17. *Απο τοτε ηρξατο ο Ιησους κηρυσσειν—From that time Jesus began to proclaim—*Then was the first example he gave of the practice. So Mt. xvi. 21. The 2d is, when the scope of the

place produces the same effect, with an adverb of time. Thus we see with equal evidence that *ἡ δε ἡμερα ηρξατο κλιειν*. L. ix. 12. must be translated, *the day began to decline*, *Αρχομενων δε ταντων γινεσθαι*. L. xxi. 28. *When these things begin to be fulfilled*. *Ουτος ο ανθρωπος ηρξατο οικοδομειν, και ουκ ισχυσεν εκτελεσαι*. L. xiv. 30. *This man began to build, but was not able to finish*. These, though the clearest, are not the only cases wherein *αρχομαι* is not redundant. The third is, when a clause is subjoined which appears to have some reference to the particular circumstance expressed by *αρχομαι*. Thus Mt. xii. 1, 2. *Οι μαθηται αυτου ηρξαντο τιλλειν σταχνας—Οι δε Φαρισαιοι ιδοντες ειπον*. The known captiousness of the Pharisees, and their forwardness, on every occasion, to reproach our Lord, give ground to think, it was the historian's intention to suggest, that the disciples were but begun to pluck the ears of corn, when they obtruded their censure, and that, consequently, *began to pluck* is not a mere pleonasm for *plucked*. The 4th and only other case which occurs, is when *αρχομαι* seems to insinuate that what was done was not much, that it was of short continuance, like an action only begun. An example of this we have in Mt. xi. 20. *Ηρξατο ονειδιζειν τας πολεις*. *He began to reproach the cities*—Mt. xxvi. 22. *ηρξαντο λεγειν εκαστος αυτων* marks more strongly the abruptness and coincidence of the cry, than *ελεγειν εκαστος* could have done. I own, however, that the two cases last mentioned have not equal evidence with the two which precede them, and would therefore condemn no interpreter for dropping *αρχομαι* in both. For my part, I choose to retain it, as I think it neither quite unmeaning, nor even unsuitable to modern idioms. Si. in Fr. in these cases, sometimes renders *αρχεσθαι* by the verb *se mettre*, which seems equivalent. Thus *Ses disciples se mirent à arracher*—and *Il se mit à reprocher*—In other cases, particularly in the text, the redundancy of *αρχομαι* is manifest.

23. *I pray thee come, and lay thy hands upon her, ινα ελθων επιθης αυτη τας χειρας*. Vul. *Veni, impone manuum super eam*. Perhaps the La. version of the words has arisen from a different reading in the original. The Cam. with other differences, has *ελθε* in the imperative. Perhaps it has been what the La. translator thought a proper expression of the sense. The conjunction *ινα*, with the subjunctive mood, not preceded by another verb, is justly to be regarded as

another form of the imperative. The only difference between it and an ordinary imperative is, that it is a more humble expression, serving to discriminate an entreaty from a command. In this respect it corresponds to the Heb. particle נָּא *na*, which, when it is subjoined to the imperative, forms, in effect, a different mood; for what two things can differ farther than *to entreat* and *to command*? Yet, to mark the difference in most languages, can be effected only by some such phrase as, *I pray thee*; which, therefore, ought not to be considered as words inserted without authority from the original, since without them the full import of the original is not expressed. It has, accordingly, been supplied in some such way in most versions. Be. says, *Rogo*; Er. Zu. and Cal. *Oro*; Dio. *Deh*; G. F. *Je te prie*; Beau. *Je vous prie*. The same may be affirmed, not only of our common version, but of the generality of Eng. translations. This remark will supersede the correction proposed by Dr. Pearce, which, though not implausible, leans too much on conjecture to be adopted here.

CHAPTER VI.

2. *And how are so great miracles, $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\iota\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$. E. T. that even such mighty works.* The conjunction $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ is wanting in a great number of MSS. including many of chief note, and in several of the oldest and best editions. Wet. and other writers reject it. Add to all these, that the sense is clearer without it.

3. *With us, $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\alpha\varsigma$. Vul. *apud nos*. To the same purpose the Sy. &c. The Seventy have employed $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in interpreting the Heb. *etsel*, which answers to the La. *juxta apud*. 2 Chr. xxviii. 15. Is. xix. 19. Jer. xli. 17. In the same way it is employed in the N.T. J. i. 1. $\acute{\omicron}$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\eta\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu$. *The word was with God*. Is there any occasion here to recur, with Markland, to classical authors, for an application of the term which must be acknowledged to be, even in them, very uncommon?*

9. *To be shod with sandals, and not to put on two coats.* The reading, in Gr. here followed, is $\text{Αλλ}' \acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\delta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\alpha\nu\delta\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\delta\iota\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\delta\upsilon\omicron$ $\chi\iota\tau\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$. Authorities are almost

equally divided between *ενδυσασθαι* in the infinitive, and *ενδυσησθε* in the imperative ; for I consider, with bishop Pearce, those copies which read *ενδυσασθε* as favouring the former, the change of the termination *αι* into *ε* being a common blunder of transcribers. Now, though the authorities, on the other side, were more numerous than they are, the sense and structure of the discourse are more than sufficient to turn the balance. Mr. had hitherto been using the oblique, not the direct, style, in the injunctions which he reports as given by our Lord. This verse, therefore, is most naturally construed with *παρηγγειλεν αυτοις* in the preceding verse. It is not usual with this writer to pass, abruptly, from the style of narration, to that of dialogue, without giving notice to the reader. It is the more improbable here, as intimation is formally given in the next verse, in regard to what follows ; *και ελεγεν αυτοις*. For, if this notice was unnecessary, when he first adopted the change of manner, it was unseasonable afterwards, as it hurt both the simplicity and the perspicuity of the discourse. I cannot help, therefore, in this instance, differing from both the late critical editors Mill and Wet.

11. *As a protestation against them, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις.* Ch. xiii. 9. N.

² *Verily I say unto you, the condition of Sodom and Gomorrah shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment, than the condition of that city.* The Gr. answering to this, *Αμην λεγω υμιν, ανεξτοτερον ζ. τ. λ.* is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. The Vul. Sax. and Cop. also, have nothing that corresponds to it.

15. *It is a Prophet, like those of ancient times, οτι προφητης εστιν, ηως εις των προφητων.* E. T. *That it is a Prophet, or as one of the Prophets.* There is, however, such a consent of MSS. several of them of the first note, versions, as Vul. Sy. Ara. Go. Cop. Sax. and Eth. with editions, Fathers, critics, for rejecting the conjunction *η*, as to remove all doubt concerning it. The sentence is also more perspicuous without it. *Οι προφηται*, used in this manner, always meant the ancient Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah—

20. *Protected, συνετηρει.* E. T. *Observed.* On the margin we read *kept, or saved him*, to wit, from the effects of Herodias' resentment. This is evidently the true version. The Vul. has *custodiebat* ; Ar. in the same sense, *conservabat* ; Er. and the other La. transla-

tors, less properly, *observabat*. That the import of the verb is *to preserve, to protect*, appears not only from the connexion in this place, but from all the other passages in the N. T. where it occurs. Mt. ix. 17. L. ii. 19. v. 38.

² *Did many things recommended by him, ακουσας αυτου, πολλα εποιει.* That Herod attended with pleasure on John's teaching, we are told, in the very next clause of the sentence, *ηδεως αυτου ηκουε*. As this ought not to be considered as a tautology, the former *ακουσας αυτου* must be regarded only as explanatory of *πολλα εποιει*, the import of which I have given in the translation.

27. *Dispatched a sentinel, αποστειλας σπεκουλατωρα.* E. T. *Sent an executioner.* The word *executioner*, with us, means one whose office it is to execute the sentence of the law on criminals. They had not then a peculiar officer for this business. The lictors, indeed, were employed in it by those Roman magistrates who were entitled to their attendance. Other persons in authority in the provinces, commonly entrusted it to some of the soldiery. The term used by Mr. is a La. word, and properly signifies *sentinel*, watch or scout.

33. *Many, who saw them depart, and knew whither they were sailing, ran out of all the cities, got thither by land before them, Ειδον αυτους υπαγοντας οι οχλοι, και επεγνωσαν αυτον πολλοι, και πεξη απο πασων των πολεων συνεδραμον εκει, και προηλθον αυτους.* E. T. *The people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran a-foot thither out of all cities, and outwent them.* There are two various readings of some moment on this passage. The first is, the omission of *οι οχλοι*, the second, the omission of *αυτον*. The authorities for both are not equal, but are, all things considered, sufficient ground for adopting them. As to the first, it is favoured by the Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Sax. and Eth. versions, and by MSS. editions, fathers, and critics, more than necessary; as to the second, the rejection of the pronoun is warranted by the Cam. and several other MSS. as well as by the Vul. which renders the words thus: *Viderunt eos abeuntes, et cognoverunt multi; et pedestres de omnibus civitatibus concurrerunt illuc, et prævenerunt eos*. But what I think a superior warrant, and a kind of intrinsic evidence, that the words in question are intruders, is, that the sense, as well as the construction (which seemed embarrassed before,) is cleared by their

removal. It could not, probably, be in the sight of the multitude that our Lord and his apostles would embark, since their intention was to be private, though many might discover it, who would inform others. That the historian should say that many knew him, now after he had been so long occupied every day in teaching them, and curing their sick, and had been constantly attended by the admiring crowd, is exceedingly improbable. There would be, comparatively, but few, if any, there who did not know him. It may be said, indeed, that when the *αυτον* is excluded, there seems to be some defect, as it is not expressly said what they knew : but this is so fully supplied by the following words, which acquaint us that the people got thither before them, as to put it beyond a doubt, that what he meant to say they knew, was the place whither our Lord and his disciples intended to sail.

² *By land.* Mt. xiv. 13. N.

³ *And came together to him, και συνηλθον προς αυτον.* This clause is wanting in three MSS. and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop. versions.

36. *Buy themselves bread for they have nothing to eat, αγορασωδιν εαντοις αρτους, τι γαρ φαγωδιν ουκ εχουδι.* Vul. *emant cibos quos manducunt.* The Cam. alone in conformity to the Vul. *αγορασωδι τι φαγειν.* In two or three MSS. of little account, there are on this clause, some other inconsiderable variations.

40. *Squares, πραβια.* E. T. *Ranks.* The word denotes a small plat, such as a flower-bed in a garden. It has this meaning in Eccles. xxiv. 31. I do not find it in the Sep. or in any other part of the N. T. These beds were in the form of oblong squares. Thus, Hesychius : *Πραβια αι εν τοις κηποις τετραγωνοι λαχανια.* To the same purpose, also, Phavorinus. The word is, therefore, very improperly, rendered either *ranks* or *rows*. That the whole people made one compact body, an hundred men in front, and fifty deep (a conceit which has arisen from observing that the product of these two numbers is five thousand,) appears totally inconsistent with the circumstances mentioned both by Mr. who calls them, in the plural, *δνιποβια* and *πραβια* and by L. who calls them *ζλιβια*.

44. *Five thousand*, ὄσσει πεντακιςχιλιοι. We have the authority of all the best MSS. editions, and versions, Vul. both the Sy. Eth. Ara. Sax. and Cop. for rejecting ὄσσει, *about*.

51. *Which struck them still more with astonishment and admiration*, και λιαν εκ περισσου εν εαυτοις εξισταντο και εθανμαζον. The two last words are wanting in three MSS. with which agree the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Cop. versions.

52. *Their minds were stupified*, ην η καρδια αυτων πεπωρωμενη, Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

CHAPTER VII.

2. *With impure, (that is, unwashen) hands*, κοινας χερσι, τουτ' εστιν αυπητοις. E. T. *With defiled, (that is to say, with unwashen) hands*. The Gr. word rendered, here, *impure*, and in the E. T. *defiled*, literally signifies *common*. It was quite in the Jewish idiom, to oppose *common* and *holy*, the most usual signification of the latter word, in the O. T. being, separated from common, and devoted to sacred, use, Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c. Their meals were (as the Apostle expresses it, 1 Tim. iv. 5.) *sanctified by the word of God and prayer*. They were, therefore, not to be touched with unhallowed hands. The superficial Pharisee, who was uniform (wherever religion was concerned) in attending to the letter, not to the spirit, of the rule, understood this as implying solely that they must wash their hands before they eat. As we learn, from antiquity, that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel in a Pagan country, and for the use of Gentile, as well as Jewish, converts, it was proper to add the explanation τουτ' εστιν αυπητοις, to the epithet κοινας, which might have otherwise been misunderstood by many readers. Pref. § 5.

3. *All the Jews who observe*. We must with Markland, render thus παντες οι Ιουδαιοι κρατουντες; otherwise we represent all the Jews as observing the traditions, though it is certain that the Sadducees did not observe them. To omit repeating the article before the participle, is not unexampled in these writings.

3, 4. *For the Pharisees—eat not until they have washed their hands, by pouring a little water upon them; and if they be come from the market by dipping them—οι γαρ Φαρισαιοι—εαν μη πλυμη*

νυπονται τας χειρας, ουκ εβδιουσι,—και απο αγορας, εαν μη βαπτισωνται, ουκ εβδιουσι. E. T. *For the Pharisees—except they wash their hands oft, eat not; and when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not.* A small degree of attention will suffice to convince a judicious reader, that there must be a mistake in this version. For if, by what we are told, v. 3. we are to understand, as is allowed by every body, that they did not eat, on any occasion, till they had washed their hands; to what purpose was this added, v. 4. *And when they came from the market, except they wash, they eat not?* Could any person suppose that, if washing before meals was a duty, their having been at the market, where they were most exposed to defilement, would release them from the obligation? Besides, there is, in the first clause, an indistinctness and obscurity which leaves the reader much at a loss for the meaning. *Except they wash oft, they eat not.* Does this imply, that they must wash often before every meal? or that their washing frequently before one meal will compensate for their not washing at all before another? It is well known, and indeed the circumstances of the story, as related here, and in Mt. may satisfy us, that neither of these was the case. For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, 1st, that the two verbs, rendered *wash* in the E. T. are different in the original. The first is *νυπονται*, properly translated *wash*; the second is *βαπτισωνται*, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for *βαπτισω* denotes *to plunge, to dip*. This naturally suggests the idea, that the word *πυγμα*, in the first clause, added to *νυπονται*, may express the manner of washing, and so complete the contrast in the first and second clauses. *Πυγμα*, according to the old lexicographers, signifies the fist, or the hand contracted for grasping; but I find no authority for rendering it *oft*. In modern lexicons *crebro* is admitted as one meaning. But this, I suspect, is solely because the Vul. so translates the word in this passage. The suspicion of Er. is not implausible, that the old translator had read *πυζη*. Perhaps it is still more likely, that he had supposed *πυγμα* to have come into the place of *πυζη*, through the blunder of some early copyist. The first Sy. translator has, from the same cause, the not understanding of the import of *πυγμα* in this place, rendered it by a word denoting *carefully*, which, though equally unwarranted, suits the sense better than *crebro*. The. who is in this followed by Euth. supposes that the word may mean *up to the elbow*. But

as neither of these seems to have been versed in Jewish ceremonies, their judgment, in a point of this kind, is of little weight. Besides, it destroys the contrast clearly indicated by the Evangelist between *νιπτειν* and *βαπτιζειν*. The opinion of Wet. I think with bishop Pearce, is on the whole, far the most probable, that the word denotes here a *handful*. This is, at least, analogical. Thus *foot*, in most languages, denotes, "the length of the foot." The like may be said of *cubit* and *span*. As the sense manifestly supplies the word *water*, the import is a handful (that is, a small quantity) of water. "*Βαπτιζεσθαι*," says that excellent critic, "est manus aquæ immergere, *νιπτεσθαι* manibus affundere." This is more especially the import, when the words are, as here, opposed to each other. Otherwise *νιπτειν* like the general word *to wash* in Eng. may be used for *βαπτιζειν*, *to dip*, because the genus comprehends the species; but not conversely *βαπτιζειν* for *νιπτειν*, the species for the genus. By this interpretation, the words, which as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical; and the contrast in the Gr. is preserved in the translation. The Vul. does not confound the two verbs as the E. T. does: at the same time it fails in marking the precise meaning of each. *Pharisei enim—nisi crebro lavcrint manus, non manducant: et a foro, nisi baptizentur, non comedunt.* Ar. whose object is to trace etymology, not to speak either intelligibly or properly, renders *πνγμη pugillatim*. Be. as unmeaningly, says *pugno*. Er. Leo. Cal. and Cas. follow the Vul. the three former saying *crebro*, the last *sæpe*. None of them sufficiently distinguishes the two verbs. They use the verb *lavare*, in the active voice, in the first clause, in the passive in the second; seeming to intimate, that in the first case the hands only were washed; in the second the whole body. The Vul. gives countenance to this interpretation. But it ought to be observed, that *βαπτιζωνται* is not in the passive voice, but in the middle, and is contrasted to *νιπωνται*, also in the middle; so that by every rule the latter must be understood actively, as well as the former. All the modern versions I have seen, are, less or more, exceptionable in the same way.

4. *Baptisms of cups, βαπτισμους ποτηριων.* E. T. *The washing of cups.* I have chosen to retain the original word for the fol-

lowing reasons : First, It is not an ordinary washing, for the sake of cleanliness, which a man may perform in any way he thinks convenient, that is here meant ; but it is a religious ceremony, practised in consequence of a sacred obligation, real or imagined. Secondly, The analogy that subsists in phraseology between the rites of the old dispensation and those of the new, ought, in my opinion, to be more clearly exhibited in translations of Scripture, than they generally are. It is evident, that first John's *baptism*, and afterwards the Christian, though of a more spiritual nature, and directed to a more sublime end, originated in the usages that had long obtained among the Jews. Yet, from the style of our Bible, a mere Eng. reader would not discover that affinity which, in this, and some other instances, is so manifest to the learned. The Heb. לָבַשׁ perfectly corresponds to the Gr. $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\omega$ and $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ which are synonymous, and is always rendered by one or other of them in the Sep. I am not for multiplying technical terms, and therefore should not blame a translation wherein the words *baptize*, *baptism*, and others of the same stamp, were not used ; if in their stead we had words of our own growth, of the same import. Only let uniformity be observed, whether in admitting, or in rejecting them ; for thus we shall sooner attain the scriptural use, and discover how far the latter were analogous to the former institutions. If it be asked, why I have not then rendered $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in the preceding clause, *baptize* ? I answer, 1st, That the appellation *baptisms*, here given to such washings, fully answers the purpose ; and, 2dly, That the way I have rendered that word, shows better the import of the contrast between it and $\nu\iota\psi\omega\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, so manifestly intended by the Evangelist. The Vul. in this instance, favours this manner, saying here, *baptismata calicum*, and Heb. ix. 10. *variis baptismatibus* ; but has not been imitated by later translators, not even by those who translated from the Vul. and have been zealous for retaining the words which are retained in that version, as consecrated.

9. *Ye judge well, continued he, in annulling, και ελεγεν αυτοις, Καλωσ αθετειτε. E.T. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject.* Bishop Pearce justly prefers the marginal version, *frustrate*, to the textuary *reject*. But I cannot approve his other amendment of disjoining the adverb *καλωσ* from *αθετειτε*, with which the structure of the sentence leads us to connect it, and prefixing it to *ελεγεν*, thus

making it, *he said well*. It would be a sufficient reason against this alteration, that, where there is not a good reason for changing, it is safer to follow the order of the words in the original. But were the Gr. what it is not, equally favourable to both interpretations, there is the strongest reason here for preferring the common one. It is not in the manner of these biographers, nor does it suit the taste that prevails through the whole of their writings, to introduce any thing said by our Lord, accompanied with an epithet expressing the opinion of the writer. They tell the world what he said, and what he did, but invariably leave the judgment that ought to be formed about both, to the discernment of their readers. The declared verdicts of others, whether friends or enemies, as becomes faithful historians, they also relate; but, like zealous disciples, wholly intent on exhibiting their Master, they care not though they themselves pass totally unnoticed. Their manner is exactly that of those who considered all his words and actions as far above standing in need of the feeble aid of their praise. The two examples produced by that author do not in the least justify the change, nor invalidate a syllable of what has been now advanced. In neither are they the words of the Evangelist, but of the interlocutors introduced in the history. The first is, J. viii. 48. *Οι Ιουδαιοι ειπον αυτω, Ουκαλωσ λεγομεν*, The Jews said to him, *Have we not reason to say?* The other is, xiii. 13. where our Lord says, *Υμεις φωνειτε με Ο διδασκαλος και Ο κυριος, και καλωσ λεγετε, Ye call me The Teacher, and The master, and ye say right*. I am aware that the difference may not be thought material; but I cannot help considering the slightest alteration as material, which affects the taste of these invaluable writings, and thereby tends to deprive us of an important criterion of their genuineness and divine original. Diss. III. § 18.—*Ye judge well*. This is spoken ironically. See notes on Mt. xxiii. 32. and xxvi. 45. and on J. iv. 17.

11, 12. *But ye maintain, 'If a man say to father or mother, 'Be it corban (that is, devoted) whatever of mine shall profit thee,' he must not thenceforth do aught for his father or his mother,* υμεις δε λεγετε, *Εαν ειπη αιθρωπος τω πατρι η τη μητρι, Κορβαν (ο εστι δωρον) ο εαν εξ εμου ωφεληθης και ουκειτι αφιερε αυτον ουδεν ποιησαι τω πατρι αυτου η τη μητρι αυτου.* *But ye say, 'If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is corban*

(that is to say, a gift) by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, he shall be free; and ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother. For the illustration of this passage, in which it must be acknowledged there is some difficulty, let us, first, attend to the phrase, *it is corban*. As *corban*, in the original, is not accompanied with the substantive verb, it suits better the import of the passage, to supply it in the imperative, *be it*, than in the indicative, *it is*. Whatever the man meant to do, it is evident that, by the form of words specified, the thing was done, and he was bound. The expression, therefore, ought not to imply that the obligation had been contracted before. Be. who has been followed by most modern translators, erred in inserting the verb *est*. He ought either, with the Vul. to have left the ellipsis unsupplied, or to have said, *sit*, or *esto*. *Korban* is a Sy. word, which this Evangelist, who did not write in a country where that language was spoken, has explained by the Gr. word *δωρον*, and signifies here *a gift made to God, or a thing devoted*. Our translators say, *by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me*; that is, when expressed more fully, ‘That is *corban*, whatever it be, by which thou mightest be profited by me.’ Now, as to the meaning of the expression, some explain it as importing, ‘Let every donation I make to God turn out to thy advantage.’ And they suppose, that when a man has once said this, he is, every time he makes a present to the temple, or an oblation on the altar to be considered as discharging the duty he owes to his parents. This seems to be the sense of the Vul. *Si dixerit homo patri aut matri, Corban (quod est donum) quodcumque ex me tibi profuerit*. To the same purpose, though in different words, Er. Zu. Cal. and Cas. From Be.’s version it would be difficult to conclude what had been his apprehension of the meaning. His words are, *Si quispiam dixerit patri vel matri, Corban (id est donum) est, quocumque a me jvari posses, insons erit*. But by a marginal note on the parallel passage in Mt. he has shown that his idea was the same with that of the ancient interpreter, “Sensus est, quicquid templo donavero, cedet, in rem tuam, perinde enim est, ac si tibi dedero.” There are several reasons which lead me to think, that this cannot be the sense of the words. In the first place, such a method of transferring the benefit of oblations and gifts (if compatible with their usages, which I very much doubt) would have deprived the giver of all the advantage

resulting from them. We may believe it would not suit the system of the covetous and politic Pharisees, who were the depositaries of the sacred treasure, to propagate the opinion, that the same gifts and offerings could be made equally to redound for the benefit of two or three, as of one. This would have been teaching the people an economy in their oblations and presents to the temple, which but ill suited the spirit of their doctrine. 2dly, The effect of this declaration could, at the most, only have been to release the son, who said so, from the obligation of giving any support to his father, or doing aught for him; but it could never be construed into a positive obligation to do nothing. By saying, 'I will do this for you, I will transfer to you the merit of all my oblations,' I cannot be understood to preclude myself from doing as much more as I please. Yet this was the effect of the words mentioned, as we learn from the sacred writers. Thus Mt. says expressly, that after a man has made this declaration, *οὐ μὴ τιμῆσῃ* (rather *τιμῆσει*, as it is in some noted MSS. and early editions,) *He shall not honour his father or his mother.* I know, that in Be.'s translation, and those which follow it, this argument is in a manner annihilated. By making the words now quoted belong to the hypothetical part of the sentence, and introducing, as the subsequent member, without warrant from the original, the words *he shall be free*, translators have darkened and enervated the whole. But that the doctrine of the Pharisees extended farther than to release the child from the duty of supporting his parents; nay, that it extended so far as to bring him under an obligation not to support them, is still more evident from what is told by Mr. *οὐκ ἐτι ἀγίτετε*, *Ye suffer him no more to do aught for his father or his mother.* This plainly expresses, not that he is at liberty to do nothing for them if he choose to do nothing, but that he must never after do aught for them, if he would. This appears, even from the common translation, whose words I have quoted; though the passage is greatly marred by the same unwarranted supply as in Mt. I may justly say *marred*, since the words supplied are inconsistent with those which follow. A man is free, who may do, or not do, as he pleases. This was not the case. The same act which superseded the obligation of the commandment, brought him under a counter-obligation, which, according to the Pharisaical doctrine, he was less at liberty to infringe than ever he had been with regard to the former. The method of getting rid of God's

commandment, we see, was easy ; but there was no release from their tradition. 3dly, Our Lord, in both places, mentions two commandments of the law, in regard to parents, the one enjoining honour to them, the other prohibiting, under the severest sanction, that kind of dishonour which consists in contumelious words. Both are introduced in illustration of the sentiment with which he began, that they preferred their own traditions to the commandments of God. Now the mention of the divine denunciation against those who treat their parents with reproachful language, was foreign to the purpose, if there was nothing in the maxims of the Pharisees here animadverted on, which tended to encourage such criminal conduct. But the speech of the son, as those interpreters explain it, “ May every offering I make to God redound to your advantage,” cannot be said to be abusive, or even disrespectful. With whatever view it may be spoken, it carries the appearance of reverence and regard. See Mt. xv. 4. N. The An. Eng. version has suggested a different meaning, to wit, that the son had actually given, or intended to give, to the temple, all that he could afford to bestow on his parents. *If any one shall tell his father or his mother, that what he could bestow for their relief is corban, that is, to be given to the temple ; you discharge him from the obligation of doing any thing for his father or his mother.* And in the parallel passage in Mt. it is—*is dedicated to the temple,*—though the original does not authorize the change of the tense. This meaning Mr. Harwood also has introduced into his paraphrase, which he calls a liberal translation. Mt. xv. 5. *But you, in direct opposition to this divine command, say, That whosoever dedicates his substance to pious and religious uses, is under no obligation to relieve an aged and necessitous parent.* And Mr. vii. 11, 12.—*that, if any man bequeath his fortune to the service of the temple, from that moment he ceases to be under any obligation at all, to relieve the most pressing wants of his aged and necessitous parents.* I do not think it necessary to attempt a refutation of this opinion, or, rather, these opinions ; for more ways than one are suggested here, and a sort of casuistry, which, by the way, savours more of the corruptions of the church than of those of the synagogue. Only let it be observed, that the second and third arguments urged against the former hypothesis, serve equally against this ; to which I shall add, that, as no Jewish customs have been

alleged in support of it, it is far from being what the words would naturally suggest. If such had been our Lord's meaning, the obvious expression would have been, *If a man say to his father, but If a man dedicate or bequeath to the temple.* Whereas the efficacy in the text is laid entirely on what he says, not on what he does, or intends to do. For my part, I agree with those who think that, by the expression which I have rendered, *be it devoted, whatever of mine shall profit thee,* the son did not directly give, or mean to give, any thing to God; he only precluded himself from giving any relief to his parents. For if he should afterwards repent of his rashness, and supply them with any thing, he had by (what I may call) eventually devoting it to God, given, according to the Pharisaic doctrine, the sacred treasury a title to reclaim it. Gro. is of opinion, that this chance of eventual profit to the treasury, whereof the priests, and the leading men of the Pharisees, had the management, contributed not a little to the establishment of such impious maxims. The words, therefore, *be it corban, or devoted,* involve an imprecation against himself, if he shall ever bestow any thing to relieve the necessities of his parents; as if he should say to them, 'May I incur all the infamy of sacrilege and perjury, if ever ye get a farthing from me;' than which we can hardly conceive any thing spoken by a son to his parents, more contemptuous, more unnatural, more barbarous, and consequently more justly termed *κακολογια, opprobrious language.* Lightfoot quotes a passage from a Rabbinical performance, which sets the intent of such expressions in the clearest light. When a man had a mind to make a vow against using any particular thing, suppose wine, he said, Let all the wine that I shall taste be *conem,* a word of similar import with *corban.* By saying so, it was not understood that he devoted any thing to God, but that he bound himself never to taste wine. And if, notwithstanding this, he was afterwards induced to drink wine, he became both sacrilegious and perjured; sacrilegious, because the wine was no sooner tasted by him than it was sacred; perjured, because he had broken his vow; for such declarations were of the nature of vows. It appears from Maimonides, that the term came, at length, to denote any thing prohibited. To say, It is *corban* to me, is to say, I dare not use it; to me it is all one as though it were consecrated to God. In the above explana-

tion, we are supported by the authority of Gro. Capellus, Lightfoot, all deeply conversant in Jewish literature ; with whom also agree these later critics, L. Cl. Beau. Wh. Wet. Pearce, and several others. Some of our late Eng. translators seem also to have adopted this interpretation. The only difficulty that remains in the sentence arises from the conjunction *και*, which, in sentences conditional or comparative, where the concluding member has an immediate dependence on the preceding, appears to break the natural connexion, by forming one of a different kind. To this I answer, with Gro. that the *και*, in the N. T. like the Heb. *ו*, is sometimes a mere expletive, and sometimes has the power of other conjunctions. I shall mention some of the examples in the Gospels, referred to by that author. The learned reader may compare the original with the common translation, Mt. xxviii. 9. L. ii. 15. 21. v. 35. ix. 51. In all these, the translators have dropped the copulative entirely. In L. ii. 27, 28. they have rendered it *then*, and in L. xiv. 1. *that*. Every impartial person will judge whether it be a greater latitude in translating to omit a conjunction, which, in certain cases not dissimilar, is allowed to be an expletive, or to insert, rather interpolate a whole clause, which is not only not necessary, but not altogether consistent with the rest of the passage. The last clause, v. 12. is here rendered more according to the sense, than according to the letter. ‘Ye maintain—he must not do,’ is entirely equivalent to, ‘Ye do not permit him to do :’ for it was only what they permitted or prohibited by their doctrine, of which he was speaking. But the former is the only way here of preserving the tenor of the discourse. In the latter, the first member of the sentence is in the words of the Pharisees, the second in the words of our Lord.

19. *It entereth not into his heart, but into his belly, whence all impurities in the victuals pass into the sink, ουκ εισπορευεται αυτου εις την καρδιαν, αλλ' εις την κοιλιαν, και εις τον αφεδρωνα εκπορευεται, καθαριζον παντα τα βρωματα.* E. T. *It entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats.* A late learned prelate, whom I have had occasion often to quote, proposes a different version of the above passage. The way in which he would render it, as may be collected from his commentary and notes, is this ; *It entereth not into his heart, but into his stomach, and goeth out into the lower part of*

the belly, which purgeth all meats. *Κοιλια*, he says, commonly rendered *belly*, is often used for *στομαχος*, *stomach*. Thus, Mt. xii. 40. Jonah is said to have been, *εν τη κοιλια*, in the belly [that is, *stomach*] of the great fish. But, let it be observed, that the Gr. word *κοιλια*, in no other way, imports *στομαχος*, than as the Eng. word *belly*, imports *stomach*. With us it is equally proper to say, that Jonah was in *the belly*, as that he was in *the stomach* of the fish. Thus we say of gluttons, that all their care is to fill their bellies. Yet in such cases we could not say that either the Gr. word, or the Eng. is used in an acceptation different from the common. Whatever goes into the stomach, goes into the belly, of which the stomach is a part. Whosoever goes to Rome goes to Italy. It is common to every language often to express the part by the whole, and the species by the genus. This kind of synecdoché is so familiar, and even so strictly proper, as hardly to deserve a place among the tropes. Let it be observed farther, that when a more extensive or general term is used, every thing advanced must be suited to the common acceptation of the term. Thus I may say indifferently, that our food goes into the stomach, or into the belly; but if I use the latter term, I cannot add, it passes thence into the intestines (these being also in the belly,) which I might have added, if in the first clause I had used the word stomach. The same holds also of the corresponding expressions in Gr. and for the same reason. Yet, in this glaringly improper manner, does the Evangelist express himself, if *αφεδρων*, as the Bishop explains it, mean a part of the belly. If it were necessary to go farther into this examination, it might be observed, that *αφεδρων*, by the explanation produced from Suidas and Pasor, which makes it, at the most, answer only to the *intestinum rectum*, will not suit his purpose, the secretion of the chyle being more the work of the other intestines. Let it, at the same time, be remembered, that the version *latrina, secessus*, is admitted, on all sides, to be according to the common meaning of the word. Add to this, that *καθαριζον* is susceptible of an easy explanation on this hypothesis. It agrees with *παν*; but *παν* does not relate to *βρωματα*. It must be explained from the subject treated, *παν κοινον, παν ακαθαρτον*. Nor can any thing be clearer than the meaning and construction, when the words are thus explained: 'Any impurity that should enter from without, with the food, into

the body, can never contaminate the man, because it nowise affects his mind, but passeth into his belly, whence it is thrown out into the sink, leaving what is fit for nourishment, clear of all dregs and defilement.' Gro. has well expressed the last clause, *Si quid est in cibo naturalis immunditia, id alvo ejectum purgat relictum in corpore cibum*. No interpretation more effectually exposes the cavil reported by Jerom. Our Lord's words, so far from implying that all that is swallowed is thrown out of the body, imply the contrary. The other interpretation requires also, that we do violence to the words, in reading *καθαριζοντα* for *καθαριζον*, without the sanction of a single MS. edition, ancient version, or early writer.

22. *Insatiable desires, πλεονεξια*. E. T. *Covetousness*. The use of the word *πλεονεξια* in the Sep. warrants interpreters to render it *covetousness*, in the N. T. But in every place where the word occurs, it does not seem to be properly limited to that meaning. Phav. and Suid. both define it *ή ύπερ της επιθυμιας του πλειονος βλαβη*, they add, *παρα τω αποστολω*, because it is not the common classical use. Now as this definition is applicable to more vices than *avarice*, there are some passages in Scripture where the sense requires it should be rendered by a more comprehensive term. This is particularly the case when the plural number is employed, as here, and 2 Pet. ii. 14.

24. *Having entered a house, εισελθων εις την οικιαν*. But a great number of MSS. many of them of the first note, have no article. Some of the earliest and best editions have none. The Sy. and the Go. interpreters have not read the article. It is rejected by Wet. and most critics.

26. *A Greek, Έλλημις*. This woman is called, Mt. xv. 21. *Canaanitish*; here a *Syrophenician*, and a *Greek*. There is in these denominations no inconsistency. By birth, she was of *Syrophenicia*; so the country about Tyre and Sidon was denominated; by descent, of *Canaan*, as most of the Tyrians and Sidonians originally were; and by religion, a *Greek*, according to the Jewish manner of distinguishing between themselves and idolaters. Ever since the Macedonian conquests, Greek became a common name for idolater, or at least one uncircumcised, and was held equivalent to Gentile. Of this we have many examples in Paul's Epistles, and

in the Acts. *Jews and Greeks*, Ἕλληνες, are the same with *Jews and Gentiles*.

31. *Leaving the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he returned*, παλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τυροῦ καὶ Σιδωνος, ἦλθε. Vul. *Iterum exiens de finibus Tyri, venit per Sidonem*. Agreeable to which are the Cop. and the Sax. versions, as well as the Cam. and two other MSS. which, instead of the three last words in Gr. read ἦλθε δια Σιδωνος. What may have recommended this reading to Dr. Mill, it has no external evidence worth mentioning, and is, besides, in itself, exceedingly improbable. Our Lord's ministry was to the Jews; and to their country he appears to have confined his journeys. Even Si. and Maldonat, though both, especially the last, not a little partial to the Vul. give the preference here to the common Gr. Maldonat says, "Credendum non est, Christum in urbes Gentilium ingressum fuisse, qui non nisi ad oves quæ perierant domûs Israel se missum dixerat."

32. *Who had an impediment in his speech*, μογιλαλον. Vul. *mutum*. This deviation from the meaning is not authorised by a single MS.

33. *Spat upon his own fingers, and put them into the man's ears, and touched his tongue*, εβαλε τοὺς δακτυλοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὠτα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πτυσας ἤψατο τῆς γλωσσοῦ αὐτοῦ. E. T. *put his fingers into his ears, and he spit and touched his tongue*. The reference of the pronoun *his* is here quite indeterminate. The Cam. MS. gives a better arrangement πτυσας, εβαλε κ' ἐ. Two other MSS. say εβαλε τοὺς δακτυλοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὠτα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤψατο—Though one or two copies are of no authority; yet as there is no doubt about the meaning, that arrangement in Eng. which conduces most to perspicuity, ought to be preferred.

34. *Ephphatha*. Pr. Mt. § 19.

CHAPTER VIII.

12. *No sign shall be given to this generation*, εἰ δοθησεται τη γενεα ταυτη σημειος. As the negative in the original is expressed by the conditional particle *εἰ* *if*, Simon, in his note on the place,

mentions this as an argument, that the words are of the nature of an oath. “Cette particule *si* semble indiquer le serment.” It is true that, among the Hebrews, the form of an oath by imprecation was very common. *God do so to me, and more also*, said Ruth to her mother-in-law, *if aught but death part thee and me*. This was an oath that she would not leave her. Sometimes there was an ellipsis of the curse, and no more than the hypothetical clause was expressed. In this case, the conditional conjunction had the force of negation, if there was no negative in the sentence; and the contrary effect, if there was. But as use in every tongue gradually varies, it is manifest, and might be proved by examples, that the conditional particle came, at length, in many cases, to be understood merely as a negative. That it is so here, we need no better evidence, than that, in all the other places of the Gospels, where we have the same declaration, what is here expressed by *ει δοθησεται σημειον*, is expressed in them by *σημειον ου δοθησεται*. Mt. xii. 39. xvi. 4. and L. xi. 29.

24. *Having looked up, και αναβλεψας*. E. T. *And he looked up*. *Αναβλεπειν* sometimes signifies *to recover sight*, sometimes *to look upwards* to an object situated above us, sometimes *to raise our eyes* from looking downwards, or even from a state of passiveness to exertion. In this sense, *to look up* is often used in Eng. As the subject, here, is the cure of a blind man, many are led to prefer the first of these senses. My reasons, for thinking differently, are as follows: 1st, When *αναβλεπειν* in the Gospel, signifies *to recover sight*, it indicates a complete recovery, which was not the case here. 2dly, If it denote, here, *he recovered his sight*, there is a contradiction in the passage, as the same reason would lead us to infer, from the very next verse, that he had not recovered it; for Jesus, after doing something further, *εποιησεν αυτον αναβλεψαι* made him again look up. 3dly, Because the man's recovering his sight is expressed by a distinct clause, *αποκατεβταθη και ενεβλεψε τηλαυγως*. There is no reason to adopt the second meaning mentioned, as the objects he had to look at appear to have been on a level with himself. The third sense, therefore, which is that of the E. T. seems entitled to the preference. The application is similar to that in the Sep. Is. xlii. 18. *Οι τυφλοι αναβλεψατε ιδειν*. E. T. *Look, ye blind, that ye may see*. That the word is sometimes used for looking at things not placed above us, is also evident from L. xxi. 1.

² *I see men, whom I distinguish from trees only by their walking*, βλέπω τους ανθρώπους ὡς δένδρα περιπατούντας. E. T. *I see men as trees walking*. But in many MSS. some of them of principal note, in several old editions, and in the commentaries of The. and Euth. the words are, βλέπω τους ανθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρώ περιπατούντας. This reading is preferred by both Mill and Wet. and is preferred by Cas. and some modern interpreters. Thus, the sentence is made to consist of two members, whereof the second is introduced as the reason for saying, in the first, that he saw men. I have endeavoured to give a just expression of the sense in the version.

26. *Neither go into the village, nor tell aught to any of the villagers*, μηδε εις την κωμην εισελθης, μηδε ειπης τιμι εν τη κωμη. Vul. *Vade in domum tuam; et si in vicum introieris, nemini dixeris*. This version has evidently sprung from a different reading; as there has been, in fact, a great deal of variety here, both in MSS. and in versions. The Sy. and a good majority of MSS. favour the common reading. Some have thought that there is an impropriety in that reading, as it seems to suppose they could relate the miracle to people in the village, though they did not enter it. But the words, ὅτι εν τη κωμη, are no more than a periphrasis for the villagers.

28. *And others, one of the Prophets*, αλλοι δε ένα των προφητων. Vul. *Alii vero quasi unum de Prophetis*. In conformity to which, the Cam. alone reads ὡς before ένα. But no translation, not even the Sax. concurs here with the Vul.

31. *He began to inform them*, ηρξατο διδασκειν αυτους. Ch. v. 17. N.

² *Be rejected*, αποδοκιμασθηναι. This word is, probably, used in reference to the expression in the Psalms, *The stone which the builders rejected*, ὃν απεδοκιμασαν, as it is rendered by the Seventy.

37. *What will a man not give?* τι δωσει ανθρωπος; E. T. *What shall a man give?* Gro. justly observes, that τι, here, is equivalent to ποσα; *How much! What great things!* The emphasis is better expressed in our language, by the negative, which, however strange it may appear, more exactly hits the sense, than a literal version.

² *Ransom*, ανταλλαγμα. E. T. *Exchange*. The Gr. word means both; but the first is, in the present case, the only proper

term in Eng. We ransom what by law, war, or accident, is forfeited, and in the power of another, though we may still be in possession : but we always exchange what we have for what we have not. If a man's life be actually taken, it is too late for bartering.

CHAPTER IX.

12, 13. *And (as it is written of the Son of Man), και πως γεγραπται επι τον υιον του ανθρωπου.* E. T. *And how it is written of the Son of Man.* Twelve MSS. amongst which are the Al. and two others of note, read *καθως* for *και πως*. I cannot help thinking this a sufficient warrant for receiving it, when, by the rules of construction, no proper meaning can be drawn from the words as they lie. The Vul. and Zu. follow the common reading, and render *πως quomodo*. Er. Cas. Cal. say *quemadmodum* ; which may be interpreted either way. Be. whether it was that he judged *καθως* the true reading, or that he thought *πως*, here of the same import, renders it *ut*. In this he has been followed by the G. F. which says *comme*, and Dio. who says *sicome*. It gives an additional probability, that a similar clause, v. 13. relating to John, as this does to Jesus, which seems, in some respect, contrasted with it, is ushered in with the conjunction *καθως*, *καθως γεγραπται επ' αυτον*. This clause is very generally understood, by interpreters, as relating to the coming, not to the sufferings, of the Baptist. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, transposed it.

20. *No sooner did he see him, ιδων αυτον.* An ambiguity in both expressions, but such as, explained either way, hurts not the the import of the passage.

23. *If thou canst believe, το ει δυνασαι πιστευσαι.* Vul. *Si potes credere.* The Sy. literally the same. I see little occasion here for criticism. The *το* is wanting in so great a number of MSS. that one who thinks the construction embarrassed by it, is excusable in rejecting it. And even if allowed to remain, it will not be pretended that such superfluous particles are entirely without example. The turns given to the words, by Gro. by Knatchbull, and other critics, though ingenious, are too artificial.

24. *Supply thou the defects of my faith, βοηθει μου τη απιστια.* E. T. *Help thou mine unbelief.* It is evident, from the preceding

clause, πιστεωω that απιστια denotes, here, a *deficient faith*. not a total *want of faith*. I have used the word *supply*, as hitting more exactly what I take to be the sense of the passage. Gro. justly expresses it, *Quod fiducia meæ deest, bonitate tua supple*. His reason for not thinking that the man asked an immediate and miraculous increase of faith, appears well founded: "Nam ut augmentum fiduciæ ab Jesu speraverit, et quidem subito, vix credibile est." The words, however, in the way I have rendered them, are susceptible of either meaning, and so have all the latitude of the original.

25. *He rebuked, επιτιμησε.* Vul. *Comminatus est*; that is, *severely threatened*. In this manner the Gr. word is rendered in the Vul. no fewer than eight times in this Gospel, where it occurs only nine times. This is the more remarkable, as in the Gospels of Mt. and L. where we often meet with it, it is not once so rendered, not even in the parallel passages to those in Mr. No. La. translator, that I know, has in this imitated the Vul. Some say *objurgavit*; some *increpavit*, or *increpuit*. Beau. who says *menaça*, and Lu. who says *hēdrauete*, are the only persons I know, who, in translating from the Gr. into modern languages, have employed a word denoting *threatened*. If there were more evidence than there is, that this is one usual acceptation of the term, there would still be sufficient ground for rejecting it as not the meaning of the Evangelists. For, 1st, the verb επιτιμαω is used when the object addressed is inanimate, as *the wind, the sea, a natural disease*; for though, in such cases, even when rendered *rebuke* or *command*, there is a propo-*peia*; yet, as we immediately perceive the sense, the expression derives both lustre and energy from the trope; whereas the mention of threats, which always introduces the idea of punishment to be inflicted on disobedience, being nowise apposite to the subject, could serve only to render the expression ridiculous. 2dly, The Evangelists have often given us the very words of the επιτιμησεις used by Jesus, but in no instance do we discover in them any thing of the nature of menace. We have one example in this very verse, for it is επιτιμησε λεγων. 3dly, The same word is adopted, Mt. xvi. 22. to express the rebuke given by Peter to his Master, in which it would be absurd to suppose that he employed threats. 4thly, The Gr. commentator Euth. has given, on Mt. xii. 16. the word παρηγγελε as synonyms to επιτιμησε. 5thly, Recourse to threats, in the orders given to individuals, would ill suit either the meekness, or the

dignity of character uniformly supported by our Lord. Even the verb *εμβριμασμαι*, though nearer in its ordinary signification to that of the La. *com-minor*, yet in no place of the Gospels, can properly be rendered *to threaten*. It is twice used by J. for *to groan*, or *to sigh deeply*. There are only two other passages in which it is applied to our Lord, once by Mt. and once by Mr. In both places the words he used are recorded, and they contain no *threatening* of any kind. The only term for *threat*, in these writers, is *απειλη*, for *to threaten*, *απειλειν* and *προσαπειλειν*.

29. *This kind cannot be dislodged unless by prayer and fasting.* Τουτο το γενος εν ουδενι δυναται εξελθειν, ει μη εν προσευχη και νηστεια. E. T. *This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.* Some doubts have been raised in regard to the meaning of the words *this kind*. The most obvious interpretation is, doubtless, that which refers them to the word *demon* immediately preceding. But as, in the parallel passage in Mt. xvii. 19. mention is made of *faith*, as the necessary qualification for dispossessing demons: Knatchbull, and others, have thought that *this kind* refers to the *faith* that is requisite. But to me it appears an insurmountable objection to this hypothesis, that we have here the same sentiment, almost the same expression, and ushered in with the same words, *this kind*, though, in what goes before, there is no mention of *faith*, or of any thing but *demon*, to which it can refer. It would be absurd to suppose that the pronouns and relatives in one Gospel refer to antecedents in another. Every one of the Gospels does, indeed, give additional information; and, in various ways, serves to throw light upon the rest. But every Gospel must be a consistent history by itself; otherwise an attempt at explanation would be in vain. Now, my argument stands thus: The story, related in both Gospels is manifestly the same; that the words in question may refer to *demon* in Mt. no person, who attentively reads the passage, can deny; that they cannot refer to *faith*, but must refer to *demon* in Mr. is equally evident. Either, then, they refer to *demon* in both, or the Evangelists contradict one another. Other arguments might be mentioned: one is, that the application of *γεμος*, to an abstract quality, such as *faith*, is, I suspect, unexampled in the language of Scripture; whereas, its application to different orders of beings, or

real existences, is perfectly common. Some have considered it as an objection to the above explanation, that it supposes different kinds of *demons*; and that the expulsion of some kinds is more difficult than that of others. I answer, 1st, The objection is founded entirely in our ignorance. Who can say that there are not different kinds of demons? or, that there may not be degrees in the power of expelling? Revelation has not said that they are all of one kind, and may be expelled with equal ease. I answer, 2dly, By *this kind*, is not meant this kind of demons, but this kind or order of beings called demons. And if there be any implicit comparison in the words, it is with other cures. Another objection is, that in Mt. xvii. 20. the power of expulsion is ascribed solely to faith; whereas, here, it is ascribed to prayer and fasting. The answer to this objection will, perhaps, show, that the question does not so much affect the import of the passage, as it affects the grammatical construction and literal interpretation of the words. By the declaration, *This kind cannot be dislodged, unless by prayer and fasting*, we are not, (as I apprehend) to understand, that a certain time was to be spent in prayer and fasting, before the expulsion of every demon; but that the power of expelling was not otherwise to be attained. *Quod est causa causæ*, say dialecticians, *est etiam causa causati*. This is conformable to the idioms which obtain in every tongue. It was evidently concerning the power of expelling that the disciples put the question, *Why could not we—?* Now, to the attainment of that power, fasting and prayer were necessary, because they were necessary to the attainment of that faith, with which it was invariably accompanied. That *ἐξελεθειν* should be used according to the import of the Heb. conjugation *hophal*, may be supported by many similar examples in the N. T.

37. *Not me, but him who sent me*, that is, ‘not so much me as him who sent me.’ Mt. ix. 13. ³ N.

40. *Whoever is not against you is for you*, ‘Ὁς οὐκ ἐστὶ καθ’ ἡμῶν. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστίν. But in a great number of MSS. some of them of note, in several editions, in the Vul. both the Sy. versions, the Sax. and the Go. the reading is *ὑμῶν* in both places, which is also preferred by Gro. Mill, and Wet.

44. 46. 48. *Their worm—and their fire*. ‘Ὁσκιωλῆξ αὐτῶν—καὶ τὸ πῦρ. Diss. XII. P. I. § 30.

CHAPTER X.

1. *Came into the confines of Judea through the country upon the Jordan*, ερχεται εις τα όρια της Ιουδαιας δια του περαν Ιορδανου. Vul. *Venit in fines Judææ ultra Jordanem*. The Sy. and the Go. appear to have read in the same manner as the Vul. agreeably to which δια του is omitted in some MSS.

12. *If a woman divorce her husband*. This practice of divorcing the husband, unwarranted by the law, had been (as Josephus informs us) introduced by Salome, sister of Herod the Great, who sent a bill of divorce to her husband Costobarus; which bad example was afterwards followed by Herodias and others. By law, it was the husband's prerogative to dissolve the marriage. The wife could do nothing by herself. When he thought fit to dissolve it, her consent was not necessary. The bill of divorce, which she received was to serve as evidence for her, that she had not deserted her husband, but was dismissed by him, and consequently free.

19. *Do no injury*, μη αποστρησης. E. T. *Defraud not*. This does not reach the full import of the Gr. verb, which comprehends alike all injuries, whether proceeding from force or from fraud, and is therefore better rendered by P. R. *Vous ne ferez tort à personne*. This is followed by Sa. Beau. and even by Si. himself, who, changing only the mood, says, *Ne faites torte à personne*. In the same way, Dio. has also rendered it. *Non far danno a niuno*; here rightly following Be. who says, *Ne danno quemquam afficito*. To the same purpose, the Vul. *Ne fraudem feceris*; by the sound of which, I suspect, our translators have been led into the version, *Defraud not*, which does not hit the meaning of the La.

21. *Carrying the cross*, αρας τον σταυρον. These words are not in the Ephrem and Cam. MSS. - There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions. Mt. x. 38. N.

25. *Pass through*, διελθειν. There is the same diversity of reading here, which was observed in the parallel place in Mt. xix. 24. But the other reading, εισελθειν, is not here so well supported by either MSS. or versions.

29. See the Note immediately following.

30. *Who shall not receive now, in this world a hundred fold, houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions.* There are two difficulties in these words, of which I have not seen a satisfactory solution. The first is, in the promise, that a man shall receive in this world, *a hundred-fold, houses, and brothers*—— The second is in the limitation, *with persecutions*. As to the first, there is no difficulty in the promise, as expressed by the Evangelists Mt. and L. To say, barely, that men shall receive a hundred-fold, for all their losses, does not imply that the compensation shall be in kind; nor do I find any difficulty in the declaration, that thus far their recompense shall be in this world. James, i. 2. advises his Christian brethren to *count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations*. Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 4. says, concerning himself, that he was *exceeding joyful in all his tribulation*. The same principle which serves to explain these passages, serves to explain the promise of a present recompense, as expressed by Mt. and L. The Christian's faith, hope, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, were more than sufficient to counterbalance all his losses. But if the mention of *houses and brothers*——, add nothing to the meaning of those Evangelists, to what purpose was it made by Mr. ? Instead of enlightening, it could only mislead, and make a retribution in kind be expected in the present life. Some things are mentioned, v. 29. of which a man can have only one: these are *father and mother*. In v. 30. we have *mothers*, but not *fathers*. *Wife* is mentioned, v. 29. but not *wives*, v. 30. Hence that profane sneer of Julian, who asked whether the Christian was to get a hundred wives. As to these omissions, however, there are some varieties in MSS. and versions. In v. 29. the word *γυναῖκα* is wanting in two MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. None, indeed, in v. 30. have either *γυναῖκα* or *γυναίκας*, but many MSS. and some of note, read *μητέρα*; many also add *καὶ πατέρα*; though these words, in the singular, ill suit the *ἐκατονταπλασιονα*, which precedes them. These differences and omissions also contribute to render the passage suspected. According to rule, if one was repeated, all should have been repeated; and the construction required the plural number in them all. Bishop Pearce suspects an interpolation, occasioned by some marginal correction, or gloss,

which must have been afterwards taken into the text. If the text has been in this way corrupted, the corruption must have been very early, since the repetition in v. 30. though with some variety, is found in all the ancient MSS. versions, and commentaries extant. In a case of this kind, I do not think a translator authorised to expunge a passage, though he may fairly mention the doubts entertained concerning it. In a late publication of Mr. Wakefield's, (*Silva Critica*) this passage is explained in such a manner (Sect. 83.) as makes the words *now in this world, a hundred-fold, houses, and brothers, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions*, to signify just nothing at all. I own, I am not fond of a comment that destroys the text, or, which amounts to the same thing, exhibits it as words without meaning. Besides, the promise here is so formally divided into two parts, one regarding the present life, the other the future, that it may be fairly questioned whether such a total annihilation of one essential part, does not bring the significance of the other, at least, under suspicion. See Mt. xxvi. 29. ² N.

² As to the other question about the qualifying words, *μετα διωγων*, I observe that the Cam. and one other MS. read *διωγμου*, agreeable to which is the Sy. version: but this makes no alteration in the sense. I observe also, that there are three MSS. none of them of any name, which read *μετα διωγμου*, *after persecution*. Wet. who commonly pays no regard to conjectural emendations, has, nevertheless, adopted this. A promise, according to the letter, regarding things merely temporal, to be accompanied *with persecutions*, that learned and ingenious critic considered as illusory. The more a man has, in that situation, his distress is the greater. He subjoins: "Omnia vero plana erunt, si, quæ etiam ingeniosa D. Heinsii conjectura fuit, sequamur codices qui habent *μετα διωγμου*. Atque ita promittuntur halcyonia et pacata tempora duris successura." Thus, Druthmar, a Benedictine monk of the ninth century, who wrote a commentary on Mt. considers the riches and power of the Pope, as a clear fulfilment of the promise with regard to Peter, who put the question, and the large endowments of the monasteries as a fulfilment to the rest. "Nunc quoque magnum regnum habet Petrus de villis et servis per omnem mundum, et ipse et omnes sancti, propter amorem Dei." I own that, to me, all things do not appear so plain, even

after the alteration proposed by Wet. If this promise, of temporal prosperity, be understood as made to individuals, how is it fulfilled to the martyrs, and to all those who continue to be persecuted to the end of their lives? But if it be understood, as those interpreters seem to fancy, of the church in general, which, after a state of persecution for near three centuries, was put by Constantine in a state of security and prosperity; the following questions will naturally occur: Do not the words here used, manifestly imply that the promise was intended for every disciple who should come within the description? Thus, v. 29. *Ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκεν*—*There is none who shall have forsaken*—30. *εαν μη λαβη*—*who shall not receive*. The Evangelists, Mt. and L. are equally explicit on this head. *Πας ος αφηκεν*—*Whosoever shall have forsaken*—*λημψεται*—*shall receive*—are the words of Mt. And in L. it is, *Ουδεις εστιν ος αφηκει*—*There is none who shall have forsaken*—*ος ου μη απολαβη*—*who shall not receive*.—It is impossible for words to make it clearer. Now, could the promise be said to affect the actual sufferers, as the words certainly imply, if all that it meant was, ‘If ye, my hearers, have given up, or shall give up, every thing for my sake, houses, lands, friends;—those who shall be in your places, three hundred years hence, who have suffered nothing, being themselves perhaps good for nothing, and have lost nothing, shall be richly rewarded for what ye have done, and shall live in great opulence and splendour.’ If understood, therefore, of an enjoyment which every persecuted individual would obtain here, after all his sufferings were over, it is not true; for many died in the cause: and, if understood of the church in general, it is not to the purpose; nor can it, by any interpretation, be made to suit the terms employed. For my part, if I were, with Heinsius and Wet. to account *μετα διωγμον*, *after persecution*, the true reading, I should heartily agree with those who consider this as a strong evidence of the millennium; for in no other way that I know, can it be consistently interpreted. I have other objections against that interpretation which makes it relate to the change that the church was to undergo, after being established by the imperial laws. If our Lord’s kingdom had been, what it was not, a worldly kingdom; if greatness in it had resulted, as in such kingdoms, from wealth and dominion, there would have been reason to consider the reign of Constantine as the halcyon days

of the church, and a blessed time to all its members. But if the reverse was the fact ; if our Lord's kingdom was purely spiritual ; if the greatness of any member resulted from his humility and usefulness ; and if superior authority arose purely from superior knowledge and charity ; if the riches of the Christian consisted in faith and good works, I am afraid the changes, introduced by the emperor, were more the corrupters, than the establishers of the kingdom of Christ. The name, indeed, was extended, the profession supported, and those who assumed the name, when it became fashionable, and a means of preferment, multiplied ; but the spirit, the life, and the power, of religion, visibly declined every day. Let us not, then, shamefully, confound the unrighteous Mammon with the hidden treasures of Christ. Those divine aphorisms, called the beatitudes, which ascribe happiness to the poor, the meek, the mournful, the hungry, the persecuted, were not calculated for a particular season, but are evidently intended to serve as fundamental maxims of the Christian commonwealth to the end of the world. Though there be, therefore, some difficulty in reconciling the words, *with persecutions*, with what is apparently a promise of secular enjoyments, it is still preferable to the other reading ; both because the correction is a mere guess, and because it is less reconcileable than this, to the state of the church militant, in any period we are yet acquainted with. For it will ever hold, that all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall, in some shape or other, suffer persecution. And to reject, on mere conjecture, because of a difficulty, real or apparent, all that Mr. has additional to what is recorded by Mt. and L. would be contrary to all the rules of sound criticism ; and might give rise to a freedom which would be subversive of the authority of Scripture altogether.

40. *I cannot give, ουκ εστιν εμου δοναι.* Vul. *Non est meum dare vobis.* In the addition of *vobis*, this interpreter is almost singular, having no warrant from MSS. and being followed only by the Sax. version. It is, besides, but ill adapted to the words in connexion. The same peculiarity in the two versions occurs also in Mt. xx. 23.

42. *Those who are accounted the princes, οι δοκουντες αρχειν.* E. T. *They which are accounted to rule.* The Gr. expression, suitably to a common idiom both in sacred, and in classical, authors, may be rendered simply, as though it were *οι αρχοντες, the princes ;*

but I think there is, here, an energy in the word *δοκουντες*, as denoting those whom the people acknowledge, and respect, as princes. It also suits the sense better to use the name *princes* here, than the verb *to rule*, which is not so well adapted to the preceding participle, *accounted*. The word *princes*, denoting strictly and originally no more than *chief men*, it may, not improperly, be regarded as merely a matter of public opinion, who they are that come under this denomination. But we cannot, with propriety, express ourselves in the same doubtful way of those who actually govern, especially when they govern, as represented here, in a severe and arbitrary manner.

46. *Son of Timeus*. This may be no more than an interpretation of the name, for so *Bartimeus* signifies; in which case the words *τουτ' εστι*, as in *Abba, father*, which occurs oftener than once, are understood.

48. *Charged him to be silent*, *επετιμων αυτω ινα σιωπηση*. See notes on Mt. xx. 31. and ch. ix. 25.

CHAPTER XI.

1. *As far as Bethphage and Bethany*, *εις Βηθφαγη και Βηθανιαν*. *Βηθφαγη και* are not in the Cam.; nor are there any words corresponding to them in the Vul. and the Sax. versions.

10. Immediately after *βασιλεια*, in the common Gr. copies, we read the words, *εν ονοματι Κυριου*, *in the name of the Lord*; but they are wanting in several MSS. some of them of principal note, and in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Arm. Ara. and Sax. versions. Origen did not read them. And they are rejected by Gro. Mill, and Ben. Their situation between *βασιλεια* and its regimen, *του πατρος ημων*, gives them much the appearance of an interpolation. Besides, the phrase, *ερχομενος εν ονοματι Κυριου*, in the preceding verse, accounts very naturally for the inadvertency of giving *ερχομενη* here the same following. There is, therefore, some reason for rejecting these words, but none, that I know, for rejecting the whole clause.

² *In the highest heaven*. L. ii. 14. N.

13. *For the fig-harvest was not yet*, *ου γαρ ην καιρος συκων*. E. T. *For the time of figs was not yet*. Waving the different hy-

potheses that have been adopted for explaining this expression, Dr. Pearce has, from several passages in sacred writ, particularly Mt. xxi. 34. justly observed, that by the time of any kind of fruit or grain, is meant the time of reaping it. This, indeed, coincides with the interpretation which a reader would naturally give it. What can the time of any fruit be, but the time of its full maturity? And what is the season of gathering, but the time of maturity? But figs may be eaten for allaying hunger, before they be fully ripe; and the declaration, that the season of figs was not yet come, cannot be (as the order of the words, in the original, would lead one at first to imagine) the reason why there was nothing but leaves on the tree: for the fig is of that tribe of vegetables, wherein the fruit appears before the leaf. But if the words, *και ελθων επ' αυτην, ουδεν ευρεν ει μη φυλλα*, be read as a parenthesis, the aforesaid declaration will be the reason of what immediately preceded, namely, our Lord's looking for fruit on the tree. The leaves showed that the figs should not only be formed, but well advanced; and the season of reaping being not yet come, removed all suspicion that they had been gathered. When both circumstances are considered, nothing can account for its want of fruit, but the barrenness of the tree. If the words had been *ουδεν ευρεν ει μη ολιιθους, ου γαρ ην καιρος συκων*, *he found nothing but green figs, for it was not the time of ripe fruit*; we should have justly concluded that the latter clause was meant, as the reason what is affirmed in the former; but, as they stand, they do not admit this interpretation. A transposition, entirely similar, we have in ch. xvi. 3, 4. The idiom of modern tongues, requiring a more rigid adherence to the customary arrangement, I have thought it reasonable to transpose the clauses. And, for removing all ambiguity, I have, after Bishop Pearce [See his Answer to Woolston on the miracles] rendered *καιρος συκων* the *fig-harvest*, (though this application of the word *harvest* is rather unusual) than by a phrase so indefinite as *the time of figs*.

15. *The temple.* Mt. xxi. 12. N.

17. *My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations, οτι ο οικος μου οικος προσευχης κληθησεται πασι τοις εθνεσιν.* E. T. *My house shall be called, of all nations, the house of prayer.* Our translators have followed Be. who renders the passage, as if the last

words had been *ὑπο παντων των εθνων*. *Domum meam domum precationis vocatum iri ab omnibus gentibus* ; and is, I think, the only La. translator, who, by inserting the preposition *ab*, has perverted the sense. He has been copied, as usual, by the G. F. *Ma. maison sera appelée maison d'oraison par toutes nations*. This is an error of the same sort with that which was observed on Mt. v. 21. See the note on that verse. The court of the Gentiles, a part of *το ἱερον*, *the temple*, as it is expressed in this passage, was particularly destined for the devout of all nations, who acknowledged the true God, though they had not subjected themselves to the Mosaic law, and were accounted aliens. The proselytes who had received circumcision, and were by consequence subject to the law, were on the same footing with native Jews, and had access to the court of the people. Justly, therefore, was the temple styled *a house of prayer for all nations*. The error in the common version is here the more extraordinary, as, in their translation of Isaiah, they render the passage quoted *for all people*.

* There is another error in the common version, in this passage, which, for aught I know, is peculiar to it. *Oikos* is rendered *the house*, not *a house*, as it ought to be. This difference, though on a superficial view it may appear inconsiderable, is, in truth, of the greatest moment. *The house of prayer* was the utmost that a Jew could have said of the temple of Jerusalem. To represent all the Gentiles, most of whom knew nothing about it, and the rest, at the furthest, put it on no better footing than the idol-temples of the surrounding nations, as using a style which implied that it was, by way of eminence, the place of all the earth appropriated to divine worship, is both misrepresenting the fact, and misrepresenting the sacred writers, who are far from advancing any thing that can be justly so interpreted.

18. *For they dreaded him*, *εφοβουντο γαρ αυτον*. I see no reason, with Pearce, to reject *αυτον*, on so slight authority as six or seven MSS. Their fear of the people, mentioned in other passages, so far from being inconsistent, naturally led them to dread one who had so great an ascendancy over the minds of the people, who exposed the hypocrisy of the spiritual guides of the age, and was so much an enemy to their traditions, and casuistry.

21. *Which thou hast devoted, ἣν καταράσῃ.* E. T. *Which thou cursedst.* In Eng. the word *cursed* is not, now, so commonly, nor I think, so properly, applied to inanimate things. Besides, that acceptance of the verb *to curse*, to which our ears are most familiarized, associates, in our minds, the idea of something, at once so atrocious, and so vulgar, as makes one dislike exceedingly the application of it, to a solemn act of our Lord, intended to convey instruction, in the most striking manner, on two important articles, the power of faith, and the danger of unfruitfulness under the means of improvement. *Devoted*, though sometimes used in a different sense, is here so fixed in meaning, by the words connected, that it is impossible to mistake it; and is surely a more decent term than *cursed*.

22. *Have faith in God, εχετε πιστιν Θεου.* That is, say some, *Have a strong faith.* The words rendered literally are, *Have a faith of God.* It is a known Hebraism, to subjoin the words of *God* to a substantive, to denote great, mighty, excellent; and to an adjective, as the sign of the superlative. In support of this interpretation, bishop Pearce has produced a number of passages, universally explained in this manner. The context here will suit either explanation. Though this is a point on which no one ought to be decisive, I cannot help, upon the whole, preferring the common version. My reasons are these: 1st, I find that the substantives construed with *Θεου*, when it signifies great or mighty (for it is only with these we are here concerned,) are names either of real substances, or of outward and visible effects. Of the first kind are, *prince, mountain, wind, cedar, city*; of the second are, *wrestling, trembling, sleep*; but nowhere, as far as I can discover, do we find any abstract quality, such as, *faith, hope, love, justice, truth, mercy*, used in this manner. When any of these words are thus construed with *God*, he is confessedly either the subject, or the object, of the affection mentioned. 2dly, The word *πιστις*, both in the Acts, and in the Epistles, is often construed with the genitive of the object, precisely in the same manner as here. Thus, Acts iii. 16. *πιστις του ονοματος αυτου* is *faith in his [Christ's] name*; Rom. iii. 22. *πιστις Ιησου Χριστου* is *faith in Jesus Christ*. See, to the same purpose, Rom. iii. 26. Gal. ii. 16. 20. iii. 22. Philip, iii. 9. *ελπις* is used in the same way, 1 Thess. i. 3. As these come much

nearer the case in hand, they are, in my judgment, more than a counterpoise to all that has been advanced in favour of the other interpretation.

CHAPTER XII.

4. *They wounded in the head with stones, λιθοβολησαντες εξεφαιλαιωσαν.* Vul. *In capite vulneraverunt.* Agreeably to this version, the Cam. and five other MSS. omit λιθοβολησαντες. The Cop. and Sax. translations following the same reading.

14. *Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give? εξεστι κηρσον Καισαρι δουναι, η ου; δωμεν, η μη δωμεν;* Vul. *Licet dare tributum Cæsari, an non dabimus?* With this agree the Go. and the Sax. The Cam. omits the whole clause δωμεν η μη δωμεν;

19. *Moses hath enacted, Μωσης εγραψεν.* E. T. *Moses wrote.* The word γραφειν, when applied to legislators, and spoken of laws, or standing rules, is, both in sacred use, and in classical, sancire, to enact.

29. *The Lord is our God: The Lord is one, Κυριος ο Θεος ημων Κυριος εις εστι.* E. T. *The Lord our God is one Lord.* The words are a quotation from Moses, Deut. vi. 4. as rendered by the Seventy. In Heb. they run thus, יהוה יהוה יהוה אחד, literally in Eng. *Jehovah our God Jehovah one.* In such sentences, there is no substantive verb in Heb. (as in European languages) to connect the words. Their juxtaposition is held sufficient. Sometimes in Gr. and La. which do not labour under the same defect, the verb is omitted as unnecessary. Now, in my apprehension (and in this I agree with Vitranga,) the words quoted ought to be rendered as two sentences; in Deut. thus, *Jehovah is our God: Jehovah is one;* and not as one sentence, *Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.* My reasons are these: 1st, It appears to have been the purpose of their great legislator to establish among the people these two important articles, as the foundation of that religious constitution he was authorized to give them. The first was, that the God, whom they were to adore, was not any of the acknowledged objects of worship

in the nations around them, and was, therefore, to be distinguished among them, the better to secure them against seduction, by the peculiar name *Jehovah*, by which alone he chose to be invoked by them. The second was the unity of the divine nature, and consequently that no pretended divinity (for all other gods were merely *pretended*) ought to be associated with the only true God, or share with him in their adoration. There is an internal probability in this explanation, arising from the consideration that these were notoriously the fundamental articles of their creed. 2dly, In the reply of the Scribe, v. 32. which was approved by our Lord, and in which we find, as it were, echoed every part of the answer that had been given to his question, there are two distinct affirmations with which he begins; these are, *There is One God*; and *there is only one*, corresponding to *The Lord is our God*, and *the Lord is one*. The first clause, in both declarations, points to the object of worship; the second, to the necessity of excluding all others. Accordingly, the radical precept relating to this subject, quoted by our Lord, Mt. iv. 10. from the Sep. is exactly suited to both parts of this declaration. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*. This may be called the positive part of the statute, and corresponds to the article, *The Lord is our God*. *Thou shalt serve him only*. This is the negative part, and corresponds to the article, *The Lord is one*. 3dly, Such short and simple sentences, without either verb or conjunction to unite them in themselves, or connect them with one another, are not unfrequent in the sacred language. An example, perfectly similar, we have, Exod. xv. 3. יהוה איש מלחמה (or, as we read in the Samaritan Pentateuch, יהוה נבור במלחמה) שמו יהוה rightly rendered in the E. T. as two distinct sentences. *The Lord is a man of war*; *The Lord is his name*: by Houbigant, *Dominus est bellator fortis*; *dominus est nomen ejus*. 4thly, It is unexampled in sacred writ, to join אחר as an adjective to a proper name. The case is different, when it is affirmed as an attribute, because then the copula or substantive verb is understood. For though the Gr. word *κύριος*, be an appellative, we ought to remember that, in this passage, it supplies the place of *Jehovah*, a proper name. Now a proper name, which naturally belongs but to one, does not admit numeral adjectives. If such an adjective, therefore, be subjoined to the name, it ought to be considered as something formally predicated of it, not as

an epithet or attendant quality. If the whole purpose of the quotation were to assert, in one sentence, the unity of the Godhead, the only natural expression in Heb. would have been יהוה אחד אלהינו יהוה, in Gr. *κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Θεὸς εἷς ἐστὶ*. *Jehovah, or The Lord our God is one God*. But, as it stands, if it had been meant for one simple affirmation, the expression would have been both unnatural and improper. The author of the Vul. seems, from a conviction of this, to have rendered the words, in defiance of the authority of MSS. *Deus unus est*. In Deut. he says, indeed, *Dominus unus est*. But in some old editions, previous to the revision and corrections of either Sixtus V. or Clement VIII. the reading is, as in Mr. *Deus unus est*. I have consulted two old editions in folio, one printed at Paris 1504, the other at Lyons 1512, both of which read in this manner.* Some may say, and it is the only objection I can think of, that though my interpretation might suit the Heb. of Deut. it does not suit the Gr. of the Evangelist. We have here the substantive verb *ἐστὶ*, which, as it is used only once in the end, seems to connect the whole into one sentence. I answer, that it is not uncommon in the penmen of the N. T. to use the copula in the last short sentence or member, and leave it to be supplied by the reader's discernment in the preceding. Thus, Mt. xi. 30. Ὁ ξυγος μου χρηστος, και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον ἐστὶ. Here every body admits, that we have two distinct affirmations, and that the *ἐστὶ*, which occurs only in the end, must be supplied in the former clause, after *χρηστος*.

² *Our God, ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν*. Three MSS. read *ὑμῶν*; one reads *σου*. Vul. *Deus tuus*.

34. *Nobody ventured to put questions to him, ουδεις ετολμα αυτον επερωτησαι*. E. T. *No man durst ask him any question*. These words convey a suggestion of some stern prohibition, or terrible menace, denounced by our Lord, which frightened every body from further attempts this way. But this was not the case. The people saw how completely those were foiled who tried to ensnare

* Since I wrote the above, I have seen an edition of the Vul. earlier than either of these, printed at Venice, 1484, in which also the expression is *Deus unus est*. These are all the editions of that Translation of an older date than the Council of Trent, which I have had occasion to see.

him by captious questions ; and how ill those succeeded, who entered into disputation with him, and were therefore naturally led, from respect to a superiority so great, and so manifest, to avoid exposing their own ignorance, or bad intention. This is sufficiently expressed in the version. J. xxi. 12. ² N.

40. *Punishment*, *κριμα*. E. T. *Damnation*. But this word with us, is confined to the *punishment of hell*, to which the impenitent will be hereafter condemned. I think it unwarrantable, in a translator, to limit the words of the sacred penmen to this meaning, when neither the terms used, nor any thing in the context, can be said to limit them. The phrases *κρισις της γεεννας* and *αιωνιος κρισις*, literally, *the punishment of hell*, and *eternal punishment*, are the only terms in the Gospels which may be properly rendered *damnation*. And even in these I think it preferable, for an obvious reason, to use the periphrasis of the sacred writer. By the frequent, unnecessary, and sometimes censurable, recourse of translators to the terms, *damned*, *damnation*, *damnable*, and others of like import, an asperity is given to the language of most modern translations of the N. T. which the original evidently has not. Ch. xvi. 16. ³ N.

41. *The treasury*, *του γαζοφυλακιου*. This name seems to have been given to those chests into which the money devoted for the use of the temple and the sacred service was put. The first account we have of such a repository, is in 2 Ki. xii. 9. But the chest mentioned there seems to have been intended for receiving only the money brought in by the priests, as it was set in the court of the priests, near the altar, a place to which they only had access ; whereas the treasury here meant, was accessible to people of all ranks and both sexes, as we learn from our Lord's remark on the gift of a poor widow. It must, consequently, have been in the court of the women, beyond which they were not permitted to go. *Gazophylacium*, from signifying the chest which contained the treasure, came to denote the place in the temple where the chest was deposited. We find our Lord, J. viii. 20. teaching in *the treasury* ; that is, I suppose, in that side of the court of the women where the sacred treasure was kept.

42. *Two mites, which make a farthing*. Diss. VIII. P. I. § 10.

CHAPTER XIII.

8. *Famines and commotions, λιμοι και ταραχαι.* Vul. *Fames.* The Cop. Sax. and Eth. read as the Vul. *Και ταραχαι* are wanting in the Cam. and one other MS.

9. *To bear testimony to them, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις.* E. T. *For a testimony against them.* Vul. *In testimonium illis.* Thus also, Mt. x.18. *εις μαρτυριον αυτοις και τοις εθνεσι.* E. T. renders, *For a testimony against them and the Gentiles.* But, in Mt. xxiv. 14. *εις μαρτυριον πασι τοις εθνεσι* is translated, *For a witness unto all nations.* This is evidently the most natural interpretation, and suits the usual import of the dative case. Nor is there aught in the context of any of the three passages that would lead one to interpret it differently from the rest. The change, consequently, appears capricious. In one place indeed, namely, ch. vi. 11. the words in connexion sufficiently warrant the change of the preposition. But that the construction there is rather unusual, may be concluded from the parallel passage, L. ix. 5. where the words are, *εις μαρτυριον επ' αυτους*, a phrase which occurs in no other part of the Gospel. Be. was the first translator who, in the verse under review, introduced the preposition *adversus*.

11. *Have no anxiety beforehand, nor premeditate what ye shall speak, μη προμεριμνατε τι λαλησητε, μηδε μελετατε.* Vul. *Nolite præcogitare quid loquamini.* The latter clause, answering to *μηδε μελετατε* is wanting here, and in the Cop. and Sax. versions. So it is also in the Cam. and four other MSS.

² *Foretold by the prophet Daniel, το ρηθεν υπο Δαβηλ του προφητου.* This clause is not in the Cam. and three other MSS. of some note. It is wanting also in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions.

32. *Or.* The common Gr. copies have *και* ; but if we judge from the value, as well as number, of MSS. which read *η*, and from the support this reading has in the ancient writers and versions, we cannot hesitate to admit it as genuine.

² *Hour, ωρας.* This word may be rendered *season.* Mt. viii. 13. N.

35. *In the evening*—These are the four night watches, answering with us to the hours of nine and twelve at night, three and six in the morning.

CHAPTER XIV.

3. *Of Spikenard*, *ναρδου πιστικης*. Vul. *Nardi spicati*. Critics have been divided about the exact import of this term. Some have thought that it has arisen from the La. name *nardus spicatus*, the latter part of which denoting the species of the plant, has, by some accident, been corrupted into *πισπικης*. Others consider this word only as an epithet, expressive of the purity or fineness of the balsam. In the former way the Vul. translates it, in the latter the Sy. As in meaning, however, they pretty much coincide, the *spikenard* being accounted the most precious kind of *nard*; it seemed better to make no alteration on the word which our translators have adopted from the Vul.

² *She broke open the box*, *συντριψασα το αλαβαστρον*. E. T. *She brake the box*. Some late translators, not seeing any necessity for breaking the box, in order to get out the liquor, have chosen to say *shook*. Blackwall (Sac. Clas. vol. ii. p. ii. ch. 3.) thinks that the breaking refers to the parts of the liquor, which would be so separated by shaking, as to diffuse their fragrance wider, and flow easier. *Συντριβειν*, I acknowledge, does not always mean *to break*; perhaps oftener *to bruise*. *Συντριβεσθαι*, however, always implies that there is violence, and that the thing spoken of has sustained damage. Now it is evident, that it is not the liquor to which the verb is applied, but the box. For though, by a common figure, the containing for the contained, the box might be used to denote the liquor; these two are here so contradistinguished, that the trope can hardly have place. The historian had told us, that the woman had *αλαβαστρον μυρου ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους*. After naming the box, the liquor is specified. To this, as being last mentioned, the participle *συντριψασα* might refer, if nothing were subjoined; but the repetition of *αλαβαστρον* after *συντριψασα*, ought, by the syntactic order, expressly to exclude that interpretation; as it could be intended only to prevent a wrong reference to *μυρον*. The *συντριψασα*, therefore, whatever it denotes, must regularly refer to the box. This, say they, is not the usual method of taking out the liquor; but it may be sometimes a necessary method. Nor does it follow, as a consequence of breaking the box, that the liquor must be lost. The effect would depend entirely on the form of the vessel,

and the manner of breaking it. We may strike off the neck of a bottle or flaggon, without spilling the liquor. I have, however, chosen the words *broke open*, as sufficiently denoting that it required an uncommon effort to bring out the contents, which is all that the word here necessarily implies. And it is a circumstance that ought not to be altogether overlooked, being an additional evidence of the woman's zeal for doing honour to her Lord. That the term ought not to be rendered *shook*, is to me evident. I know no example of it in this meaning in any author, sacred or profane. Verbs denoting *to shake*, frequently occur in scripture. But the word is never *δυντριβω*, but *τινασσω*, *σειω*, *σαλειω*.

14. *The guest chamber*, το καταλυμα. L. ii. 7. ' N.

15. *Furnished*, εστρωμενον. I have followed the E. T. in rendering the Gr. word by a general term. To make a stricter interpretation intelligible to ordinary readers, would require more circumlocution than it would be proper to introduce into so simple a narrative. The Eng. word, which comes nearest the import of the Gr. is *carpeted*. But when this term is used, as here, of a dining-room, it is not meant (as without an explanation would occur to us) only of the floor, but of the couches on which the guests reclined at meals. On these they were wont, for the sake both of neatness and of conveniency, to spread a coverlet or carpet. As this was commonly the last thing they did in dressing the room, it may not improperly be employed to denote the whole.

22. *Take, eat, this is my body*, λαβετε, φαγετε, τουτο εστι το σωμα μου. Vul. *Sumite, hoc est corpus meum*. The same defect is in both the Sy. the Cop. the Ara. the Sax. and the Eth. versions. The Al. and some other noted MSS. omit φαγετε.

30. *Even thou*. Though, in the common Gr. we have not the pronoun *συ* after *δτι*, it is found in so great a number of MSS. many of them of principal note, in so many ancient versions, fathers, and early editions, that it has been generally received by critics. That *συ* is emphatical in this place there can be no doubt. Peter's solemn declaration ended with these words, *αλλ' ουκ εγω*. Our Lord's words *δτι συ* stand directly opposed to them. It may be added, that the pronoun, in the learned languages, being in such cases unnecessary for expressing the sense, because its power is included in the verb,

is hardly ever mentioned but with an emphasis, which can rarely be transfused into modern tongues without the aid of some particle, as here of the adverb *even*.

41. *All is over, απεχει.* E. T. *It is enough.* This expression is here both indefinite and obscure. L. Cl.'s version is nearer the point. *C'est une affaire faite,* or An. *'Tis done.* The intention was manifestly to signify that the time wherein they might have been of use to him by their counsel and comfort, was now lost; and that he was in a manner already in the hands of his enemies.

43. *Clubs.* L. xxii. 52. N.

51. *Who had only a linen cloth wrapt about his body, περιβεβλημενος σινδονα επι γυμνου.* E. T. *Having a linen cloth cast about his naked body.* Br. Pearce supposes this to have been a tunic, or vestcoat, the garment worn next the skin (for shirts, as necessary as we imagine them, appear to be of a later date, unless we give that name to a linen tunic :) but the words in connexion, *περιβεβλημενος επι γυμνου,* lead us to think that this was a loose cloth cast carelessly about him. The historian would never have added *επι γυμνου,* speaking of the tunic, or, as we commonly render it, *coat,* which was always *επι γυμνου,* close to the body. By this, on the contrary, he signifies that the man had on no tunic, and was consequently obliged to make his escape naked, when they pulled off his wrapper. Besides, a man's appearing only in his tunic was nothing extraordinary, and would never have excited the attention of the soldiers. The common people, on ordinary occasions, or when employed in manual labour, seldom appeared otherwise. What our Lord says, ch. xiii. 16. *Let not him who shall be in the field turn back to fetch his mantle,* is an evidence of this; for these two, *the tunic and the mantle,* completed their dress.

² *The soldiers, οι νεανιστοι.* E. T. *The young men.* A common denomination for soldiers among the Greeks. Had the Evangelist said *νεανιστοι τινες,* or simply *νεανιστοι,* I should have rendered it *young men.* The definite expression *οι νεανιστοι* points to a known part of the company, which could be no other than *the soldiers.* Though this incident, recorded by Mr. may not appear of great moment, it is, in my opinion, one of those circumstances we call a picturesque, which, though in a manner unconnected with the

story, enlivens the narrative, and adds to its credibility. It must have been late in the night, when (as has been very probably conjectured) some young man, whose house lay near the garden, being roused out of sleep by the noise of the soldiers and armed retinue passing by, got up, stimulated by curiosity, wrapt himself (as Casaubon supposes) in the cloth in which he had been sleeping and ran after them. This is such an incident as is very likely to have happened, but most unlikely to have been invented. It is proper to add that *οι τεταριστοι* are wanting in the Cam. and two other MSS. with which agree the Vul. Sy. Cop. Ara. and Sax. versions.

53. *All the chief priests, παντες οι αρχιερεις.* Vul. *Omnes sacerdotes.* The interpreter seems to have read *ιερεις*. But this reading is not warranted by any MS. or version, except the Sax.

56. *Were insufficient, ισαι ουκ ισαν.* E. T. *Agreed not together.* Vul. *Convenientia testimonia non erant.* Between these two ways of rendering this passage, translators have been divided. Er. and Zu. are the only La. translators I have seen who agree with that here given, *nec erant satis idonea.* The Fr. translations also of P. R. L. Cl. and Beau. the Eng. An. and Wes. concur with mine. On a doubtful point, where the words appear susceptible of either interpretation, one ought to be determined by the circumstances of the case. Now there is nothing, in the whole narrative, that insinuates the smallest discrepancy among the witnesses. On the contrary, in the Gospels, the testimony specified is mentioned as given by all the witnesses. The differences in Mt. and Mr. one saying, *I will rebuild*, another, *I can rebuild*; one adding, *made with hands*, another omitting it, not only are of no moment in themselves, but are manifestly differences in the reports of the Evangelists, not in the testimony of the witnesses; nor are they greater than those which occur in most other facts related from memory. What therefore perplexed the pontiffs and the scribes, was that, admitting all that was attested, it did not amount to what could be accounted a capital crime. This made the high-priest think of extorting from our Lord's mouth, a confession which might supply the defects of evidence. This expedient succeeded to their wish. Jesus, though not outwitted by their subtilty was noway disposed to decline suffering, and, therefore, readily supplied them with the pretext they wanted.

59. *Defective.* See the last note.

61. *The Son of the blessed One, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ.* Vul. *Filius Dei benedicit.* In the Al. and other two MSS. we read Θεοῦ τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ. But it is entirely suitable to the Heb. idiom, to employ the adjective εὐλογητος, without the noun, as a distinguishing appellation of God.

70. The clause καὶ ἡ λαλία σου ὁμοιαζει is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. with which agree the Vul. Cop. and Sax. versions.

72. *Reflecting thereon, he wept, ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαει.* E. T. *When he thought thereon, he wept.* There are not many words in Scripture which have undergone more interpretations than this term, ἐπιβαλὼν. The Vul. perhaps from a different reading, followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Cal. says, *Cæpit flere.* In this also agree the Sy. the Sax. and the Go. versions. Ar. *Separans se flevit.* Be. *Quum se proripuisse, flevit.* Dio. *Si mise a piangere.* G. F. after Be. *S'estant jetté hors il pleura.* P. R. Beau. and L. Cl. as Dio. *Il se mit a pleurer.* Hey. *He burst into tears.* Almost all our other Eng. versions of this century, An. Dod. Wes. Wor. Wy. have it, *He covered his head, or his face, and wept.* Schmidius and Raphelius have, warmly, but not, in my judgment, successfully, defended Be.'s version, making ἐπιβαλλειν to mean, *se foras proripere sive ejicere, to rush out.* Elsner has clearly shown, that the examples produced in support of this interpretation, conclude nothing; and that the word, as its etymology suggests, denotes more properly, *to rush in,* than *to rush out.* Accordingly, when it is construed with a preposition, the preposition is always εἰς, or ἐπι, never ἐξ or ἀπο. He, therefore, prefers an explanation which had been first given by The. and afterwards defended by Salmasius, and others: *Having covered his head, he wept.* Yet the Gr. commentator does not give this as the certain meaning of the word; but mentions two interpretations, leaving it to the reader to make his choice. His words are, ἐπιβαλὼν, γὰρ φησιν, ἐκλαει, τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἐπικαλυψαμεῖος τὴν κηφαλὴν, ἢ ἀντι τοῦ, ἀρξάμενος μετὰ σφοδρότητος. But has any authority been produced for rendering ἐπιβαλλειν, by itself, *to cover the head?* The authority of The. himself, a writer of the eleventh century, especially on a point of which he is evidently doubtful, will not go far. Pains have been taken to evince that the Greeks

and Romans (for nothing, if I remember right, has been affirmed of the Jews) had such a custom ; but not that it was ever expressed by the single word *επιβαλλω*. It is natural in a man who weeps, to endeavour to hide his face ; not so much to conceal his emotion, as to conceal the effect of it, the distortion it brings upon his countenance. But the matter of consequence to Peter, was to conceal his emotion altogether. Now, he could not have taken a more effectual method of publishing it to all around him, than by muffling up his head in his mantle. This could not fail to attract the attention of many who had no opportunity of observing the change on his features. I consider the version of this word in Dio. Beau. and L. Cl. as made from the Vul. or the Cam. the only Gr. copy which reads *ηρξατο κλαιειν*. Hey's seems to be a free version of The.'s *αρξαμενος μετα σφοδροτητος, εκλαιε*. In regard to what appears to have been the oldest manner of translating the word *επιβαλων*, *he began* ; I should, with Palairret, have no objection to it, had the words been *επεβαλε κλαιειν*, and not *επιβαλων εκλαιε* ; for though, no phrase in Scripture is more common, than *he began to do*, for *he did* ; we do not find a single instance in which the first verb is expressed by the participle, and the second by the indicative mood (I might add, or in which *επιβαλλειν* is used for *to begin* ;) now the form, in idiomatic phrases, must be carefully observed, for they hardly ever convey the same sense, when differently construed. Simon of the Oratory, after Gro. makes this participle equivalent to the Heb. *הסי* *addens*. But it is remarkable, that though the verb *επιβαλλω* occurs very often in the version of the Seventy, they have not once used it in translating the Heb. *הסס* which is also a very common verb. Palairret follows Ham. who has given a version which differs from all the preceding, *He looked upon him [Jesus,] and wept*. But our former question recurs, Where do we find *επιβαλλω* without any addition, used in this sense ? Not one quotation where the verb is not followed by *οφθαλμοις*, *οφεις*, or *ομματα*, has been brought in support of this meaning. The meanings would be endless which might be given it, should we form an interpretation from every word that may be construed with *επιβαλλω*. After weighing, impartially the above and other explanations, I think, with Wet. that the sense exhibited by the E. T. is the most probable. That there is an ellipsis in the words, is undeniable. Now, we can never plead use in fa-

vous of a particular signification of an elliptic term, but when we can show that such is the meaning of the word where there is the same ellipsis. To say *επιβαλλειν* means *to look upon*, because *επιβαλλειν οφθαλμους* has that meaning; or that it signifies *to cover the face*, because *βαλλειν φαρη επ' ομματων* has that signification, appears to me so extraordinary a mode of reasoning, that I am surprised to find critics of undoubted learning and discernment adopting it. If I should produce examples of *επιβαλλειν τον νουν*, or *την διανοιαν*, as signifying to think of a thing, to reflect upon it, than which nothing is easier; I should give full as much probability to this signification of the word *επιβαλλειν*, when alone, as has been given by any quotations I have yet seen, to the most plausible of the meanings above mentioned. But more can be said here. The verb by itself is explained by Phavorinus, as admitting this interpretation. *Επιβαλλει ουν τις νοηματι η εργω, η γουν η κριβωμενως και επιτυχως νοει, ο και επιβολως φαμεν.* Suidas explains *επιβολη* by *εννοια*. And of the word used singly in this acceptation, Wet. has produced clear examples from Polybius, Theophrastus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Diogenes Laertius, and several others, to which I refer the learned reader; and shall only add, that if these authorities do not put the matter beyond all question, they, at least, give it a greater probability than has been yet given to any of the other hypotheses.

CHAPTER XV.

5. *Answered no more, ουκει ουδεν απεκριθη.* E. T. *Yet answered nothing.* But this implies that he had answered nothing to the former question; the reverse of which is the fact, as appears, v. 2. and is justly observed by bishop Pearce. All the La. translators say rightly, *Nihil amplius respondit*, or what is manifestly equivalent. All the foreign translations, I have seen, give the same sense. Yet, to show how difficult it is to preserve an uniform attention, and how liable, at times, even judicious persons are to run blindfolded into the errors of their predecessors, it may be observed, that Wes. is the only modern Eng. translator who has escaped a blunder, not more repugnant to the fact, as recorded in the verses immediately preceding, than contradictory to the import of the Gr. expression here used. His version is, *Answered nothing any more.* The rest, without exception, say, *Still answered nothing*, or words to

that purpose. Yet, in the G. E. the sense was truly exhibited, *Answered no more at all.*

7. *Who in their sedition had committed murder, οτιτινες εν τη στασει φονον πεποιηκεισαν.* Vul. *Qui in seditione fecerat homicidium.* No MS. authorizes this rendering.

8 *With clamour the multitude demanded, Αναβοησας ο οχλος ηρξατο αιτεισθαι.* Vul. *Cum ascendisset turba cepit rogare.* Accordingly the Vat. MS. has *αναβας* for *αναβοησας*. Agreeable to which are also the Cop. and Eth. version. The Cam. reads *αναβας ολος*, and is followed by the Go. but not by the Sax. which has nothing answering to the first clause, *Cum ascendisset*, but is, in what follows, conformable to the Vul.

12. *What then would ye have me do with him whom ye call king of the Jews? Τι ουν θελετε ποιησω ον λεγετε βασιλεα των Ιουδαιων;* Vul *Quid ergo vultis faciam regi Judæorum?* But in this omission the Vul. is singular. There is no Gr. MS. known as yet, which has not *ον λεγετε*: no version, except the Sax. which does not translate it.

25. *Nailed him to the cross, εσταυρωσαν αυτον.* E. T. *Crucified him.* The Eng. verb, *to crucify*, denotes, properly, to put to death by nailing to the cross. The word *σταυρωω*, here, means no more than *to fasten to the cross with nails.* In strict propriety, we should not say a man cried out after he was crucified, but after he was nailed to the cross.

² *The third hour.* J. xix. 14. N.

34. *Eloi, Ελωι.* This is the Sy. as well as the Heb. word for *my God.* See J. xx. 17. in the Sy. version. It is there pronounced *Elohi*: but the aspiration must be dropt, when written in Gr. letters, as it suits not the analogy of the Gr. language, to admit it in the middle, or at the end, of a word. For this reason they say *Abraam*, not *Abraham*; *Judas*, not *Judah.*

42. *When it was evening, και ηδη οψιας γενομενης.* The word answering to *evening* is used with some latitude in Scripture. The Jews spoke of two evenings, Mt. xiv. 23. N. It is probably the former of these that is meant here, and Mt. xxvii. 57. for at six *the preparation ended*, and *the Sabbath* began, when they durst no longer be so employed.

43. *Senator. Βουλευτης.* L. xxiii. 30. N.

44. *Pilate, amazed that he was so soon dead, ὁ δε Πιλατος θαυμασεν, ει ηδη τεθνηκε.* E. T. *And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead.* Raphelius, with whom agrees bishop Pearce, has shown, by examples from Xenophon and Eusebius, that the conjunction ει is, in some cases, properly translated *that*. We have a strong evidence that this is the meaning here, from the question put to the centurion, *whether Jesus had been dead, παλαι, any time, not ηδη, already.* That there are two MSS. which read ηδη, is, perhaps, not worth mentioning.

CHAPTER XVI.

2. *About sun-rise, ανατειλαντος του ηλιου.* E. T. *At the rising of the sun.* Vul. *Orto jam sole.* This expresses too much ; for let it be observed, that it is not the preterperfect participle that is here used by the Evangelist, but an aorist. Nor is there a word in the Gr. (except in a very few copies) nor in any other ancient version, answering to *jam* in the La. The E. T. seems in this place, to follow the Cam. which reads ανατελλοντος in the present. But this reading is peculiar to that copy.

8. *Getting out, fled, εξελθουσαι ταχυ εφυγον.* E. T. *Went out quickly, and fled.* But the word ταχυ is wanting in a great number of MSS. some of them of principal note, in several of the best editions, and ancient versions, particularly the Vul. and both the Sy. It is also rejected by Mill and Wet.

16. *He who shall believe, ὁ πιστευσας.* E. T. *He who believeth.* The Gr. aorists have not always the power of the preterite ; but, agreeably to the import of the name, are frequently indefinite in regard to time. Here they are better rendered by the present, as in the E. T. than by the past ; the present, with us, being often used indefinitely. Had the words immediately preceding related to a judgment to come, the most proper sense, here, in Eng. for expressing the Gr. aorist, would have been the future perfect ; that is, a future which is past, in respect of another future referred to. *He who shall have believed, shall be saved.* In this manner all the La. translators, except Ar. have expressed it : *Qui crediderit.* But, as the words immediately preceding are an order to the apostles, with which the words of this passage are connected, as regarding what is necessari-

ly consequent on the execution of that order (for of necessity they would be either believed or disbelieved,) the time is, in our idiom, best expressed by a simple future. Though the future perfect could not be accounted improper, it is so complex [*He who shall have believed, and shall have been baptized,*] that, unless where perspicuity renders it necessary, it is better to avoid it. The later Fr. translators (though that tense be, in their language, a degree simpler than in ours) take this method. P. R. Sa. and Si. though translating from the Vul. and Beau. say *Celui qui croira, not qui aura cru.*

² *He who shall believe—he who will not believe, ὁ πιστεύσας—ὁ ἀπιστήσας.* E. T. *He that believeth—he that believeth not.* The change of the future from *shall* to *will*, may, to a superficial view, appear capricious; but I imagine the idiom of the language requires this distinction, between a positive and a negative condition. It is accordingly expressed in the same manner in the G. E. A sovereign might properly say to his minister, ‘Publish, in my name, this edict to the people; if they shall obey it, they shall be rewarded, but if they will not obey, they shall be punished.’ In the former part of the declaration, it is not the will that is required, so much as the performance: in the latter part, a threat is annexed to the non-performance, merely on account of the obstinacy, that is, perversity, of will, by which it is occasioned. This distinction particularly suits the nature of the present case. The belief that results not from evidence, but from an inclination to believe, is not styled *faith*, so properly as *credulity*, which is always accounted an extreme. Nor is that *unbelief*, or even *disbelief*, criminal, that is not justly imputable to a *disinclination*, to believe, in spite of evidence, which is termed *incredulity*, and is as much an extreme as the other. It is required, not that our will operate in producing belief (ample evidence is afforded for this purpose, as mentioned in the two subsequent verses,) but that our will do not operate in a contrary direction, to prevent or obstruct our believing. God alone gives light, he requires of us only that we do not shut our eyes against it. It may be thought an objection to this explanation, that it would imply, that there is a *demerit* in the unbelief that is punishable, at the same time that there is no *merit* in the faith that is to be rewarded. This is doubtless the case. There is no positive *merit* in faith; and if, when compared with infidelity, there may be

ascribed to it a sort of negative merit, the term is evidently used in a sense not strictly proper. But this is no objection to the explanation given above. These contraries do not stand on a footing entirely similar. Death, we know, is the wages of sin; but eternal life, which is the same with salvation, is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

³ *Shall be condemned, κατακριθησεται.* E. T. *Shall be damned.* But this is not a just version of the Gr. word. The term *damned*, with us, relates solely to the doom which shall be pronounced upon the wicked at the last day. This cannot be affirmed, with truth, of the Gr. *κατακρινω*, which corresponds exactly to the Eng. verb. *condemn*. It may relate to that future sentence, and it may not. All the La. translations I know, Vul. Ar. Zu. Er. Cas. Cal. Be. say, *condemnabitur*. But if the word had been *damnabitur*, it would have made no difference, as these two La. verbs are synonymous. It is not so with the Eng. words, *to damn*, and *to condemn*. I cannot help observing, that though the Itn. and Fr. languages have verbs exactly corresponding, in the difference of their meanings, to the two Eng. verbs, their translators have, very properly, preferred the more general term. Dio. says, *Sara condannato*: G. F. L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Si. Sa. *Sara condanné*. In regard to the more modern Eng. versions, they have all replaced the proper word *condemned*, except Wes. who retains the term of the common translation. Ch. xii. 40. N. It is still worse to render the simple verb *κριειν* (2 Thess. ii. 12) *to damn*; that verb properly signifying not so much as *to condemn*, but *to judge*, *to try*: though sometimes used by a figure, the cause for the consequence, to denote *to punish*.

Jerom has observed, that there were few of the Gr. copies, he had seen, which had the last twelve verses of this chapter. They are still wanting in many MSS. and are not comprehended in the canons of Eusebius. But they are in the Sy. version, the Ara. and the Vul. and were in the old Itc. and other ancient versions. They are in the Al. and Cam. MSS. They are, also, in The's Commentaries. But what weighs most with me, I acknowledge, is, that the manner wherein so ancient a writer as Irenæus, in the second century, refers to this Gospel, renders it highly probable that the whole passage was read in all the copies known to him. *In fine autem evangelii, ait Marcus, "Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cælos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei."* Adv. Hær. lib. iii.

cap. 11. The verse quoted is the nineteenth, and the chapter has but twenty. It deserves our notice, that there is not a single MS. which has this verse, that has not, also, the whole passage from the eighth to the end ; nor is there a MS. which wants this verse, that does not also want the whole. No authority, of equal antiquity, has yet been produced upon the other side. It has been conjectured, that the difficulty of reconciling the account, here given, of our Lord's appearances, after his resurrection, with those of the other Evangelists, has emboldened some transcribers to omit them. The plausibility of this conjecture, the abruptness of the conclusion of this history, without the words in question, and the want of any thing like a reason for adding them, if they had not been there originally, render their authenticity, at least, probable. Transcribers sometimes presume to add and alter, in order to remove contradictions, but not, as far as I can remember, in order to make them.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY LUKE.

CHAPTER I.

1. *Things which have been accomplished amongst us, των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων.* E. T. *Things which are most surely believed among us.* Vul. *Quæ in nobis complete sunt rerum.* Lu. **So under uns ergangen sind.** Be. *Rerum quarum plena fides nobis facta est.* As the greater part of modern interpreters, who have written since, both abroad and at home, adopt with Be. the latter method of translating, it is proper to assign my reasons for joining Lu. Ham. and the few, who, with the Vul. prefer the former. The verb *πληροφορεω* admits, in Scripture, two interpretations. One is, *to perform, fulfil, or accomplish*; the other, *to convince, persuade, or embolden*, that is, to inspire with that confidence which is commonly consequent upon conviction; and hence the noun *πληροφορια* denotes *conviction, assurance, confidence.* The passive *πληροφορομαι* is accordingly either *to be performed, &c.* or *to be convinced, &c.* Now, as it is only of things that we can say, *They are performed*, and of persons, *They are convinced*, there can be little doubt in any occurrence, about the signification of the word. But, in the way in which Be. and others have rendered this verse, neither of these senses is given to the term. That they have purposely avoided the first signification, they acknowledge; nor can it be denied that, aware of the absurdity of speaking of things being *convinced, persuaded, or emboldened*, they have eluded the second. For this reason, they have adopted some term nearly related to this meaning, but not coincident with it, or have disguised the deviation by a periphrasis. Our translators have rendered *πεπληροφορημενων* *most surely believed*, after Er. *quæ certissima*

fidei sunt. But where do we find *πληροφορεῖν* signifying *to believe*? Not in Scripture, I suspect: but, that we may not decide rashly, let us examine the places where the word occurs. Paul says, concerning Abraham (Rom. iv. 21.) *πληροφορηθεις ὅτι ὁ ἐπηγγέλταί [ὁ Θεός] δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιηταί, being convinced that God is able to perform what he hath promised.* Again, in recommending to the Romans moderation and tolerance towards one another, as to days and meats, of which some made distinctions, and others did not, he says (Rom. xiv. 5.), *ἐκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοί πληροφορεῖσθῶ, Let every man be convinced in his own mind.* If in such points he act upon conviction, though erroneous, it is enough. As, in both these, it is to persons that this quality is attributed, there has never been any doubt about the meaning. Only we may remark, upon the last example, that it is a direct confutation of what Be. affirms in his notes on *L.* to be the import of the word, namely, that it implies not the conviction produced, but the full sufficiency of the evidence given. *Τὸ πληροφορεῖσθαι,* says he, *ad res accommodatum, res significat ita certis testimoniis comprobatus, ut de iis ambigi meritò non possit.* Again, *Nec enim hic dictum voluit Lucas fuisse certam ab auditoribus adhibitam Evangelicæ doctrinæ fidem, sed ea sese scripturum de Christi dictis et factis, quæ certissimis testimoniis vera esse constitisset.* Now, in the passage quoted, we find it applied alike to the persuasion of opposite opinions, to wit, that there ought, and that there ought not, to be made a distinction of days and meats. Now, as two contradictory opinions cannot be both true, neither can both be supported by irrefragable evidence. Yet the Apostle says, concerning both, *πληροφορεῖσθῶ ἐκαστος.* The term, therefore, has no relation to the strength or weakness of the evidence; it solely expresses the conviction produced in the mind, whether by real evidence, or by what only appears such. Though both, therefore, deviate, the *E. T.* deviates less than *Be.* But to return: there are also in Paul's Epistles two examples of this verb applied to things. He says to Timothy (2 Tim. iv. 5.), *τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφοροῦησον, fulfil thy ministry,* agreeably to the rendering of the Vul. *ministerium tuum imple,* and of all the ancient translations. *Be.* in conformity to his own explanation of the word *ministerii tui plenam fidem facito,* literally rendered by our interpreters, *make full proof of thy ministry,* as though it were not so much an object to a Christian minister to discharge his duty as to

approve himself to men ; whereas, the former is certainly the primary object, the latter but a secondary one at best. This manner is, besides, worse adapted than the other, both to the spirit of Christian morality, which, inspiring with a superiority to the opinions of fallible men, fixes the attention on the unerring judgment of God ; and to the simplicity of the apostolical injunctions. The only other passage is in the same chapter (iv. 17.), 'Ο δε Κυριος μοι παρεστη, και ενεδυναμωσε με, να δι' εμου το κηρυγμα πληροφορηθη. The last clause is rendered by the Vul. *ut per me prædicatio impletur, that by me the preaching may be accomplished.* Be. after his manner, *ut per me plenè certioraretur præconium,* and after him the E. T. *that by me the preaching might be fully known.* This method has here the additional disadvantage, that it makes the next clause a repetition of the sentiment in other words, and *that all the Gentiles might hear.* Er. has been so sensible of this, that he has deserted his ordinary manner, and said, *ut per me præconium expleretur.* The word occurs only once in the Sep. and, as it is applied to persons, it signifies, *persuaded, emboldened* (Eccl. viii. 11.) *δια τουτο επληροφορηθη καρδια υιων του ανθρωπου εν αυτοις του ποιησαι το πονηρον.* *Therefore the heart of the sons of men is emboldened to do evil.* It answers in this place to the Heb. *אמלא* *mala,* usually rendered *πληρωω.* I shall only add, that the sense here assigned is better suited to the spirit and tenor of these histories than the other. A simple narrative of the facts is given ; but no attempt is made, by argument, asseveration, or animated expression, to bias the understanding, or work upon the passions. The naked truth is left to its own native evidence. The writers betray no suspicion of its insufficiency. This method of theirs has more of genuine dignity than the other, and, if I mistake not, has been productive of more durable consequences than ever yet resulted from the arts of rhetoricians, and the enticing words of man's wisdom. The examples from pagan authors will be found to confirm, instead of confuting, the explanation given above. I desire no better instance than the quotation from Ctesias adduced by Wetstein, which appeared to Mr. Parkhurst so satisfactory a support of Beza's interpretation, *Πολλοις ουν λογοις και ορκοις πληροφορησαντες Μεγαβυζον,* "Having convinced Megabyzus with many words and oaths." In this way rendered, the words are perfectly intelligible, and suit the scope of the writer. But will any one say that Ctesias meant to affirm

that many words and oaths are a full proof of the truth of an opinion? We all know that they not only are the common resource of those who are conscious that they have no proof or evidence to offer, but with many are more powerful than demonstration itself, in producing conviction.

2. *Afterwards ministers of the word, ὑπηρεται γενομενοι του λογου.* Vul. *Ministri fuerunt sermonis.* I have here also preferred the rendering of the Vul. to that of some modern La. interpreters, who have given a very different sense to the expression. In this I am happy in the concurrence of our translators, who have, in opposition to Be. followed the old interpreter. However, as the authorities on the other side are considerable, it is proper to assign the reasons of this preference. There are three senses which have been put upon the words. First, by ὁ λογος some have thought that our Lord Jesus Christ is meant, who is sometimes so denominated by John. But this opinion is quite improbable, inasmuch as the idiom is peculiar to that Apostle. And even if this were the meaning of the word here, it ought not to be differently translated, because *ministers of the word* is just as much fitted for conveying it in Eng. as *ὑπηρεται του λογου* is in Gr. The Eng. name is neither more seldom nor less plainly given him in the translation, than the Gr. name is given him in the original. If there be any obscurity or ambiguity in the one, there is the same in the other. The second meaning is that which most modern interpreters have adopted, who render *του λογου* *the thing*, not *the word*; supposing it to denote the same with *πραγματων* in the preceding verse; and understand by *υπηρεται* those concerned in the events, either as subordinate agents in effecting them, or as partakers in their immediate consequences. Thus Be. *administri ipsius rei*; Cas. to the same purpose, *administratores rei*; Er. followed by the interpreter of Zu. more in the style of Virgil than of Luke, *qui pars aliqua eorum fuerant*; and these have had their imitators among the translators into modern languages. Now my reasons for not adopting this manner, which is supported by expositors of great name, are the following: 1st, If *λογος* had meant here (as I acknowledge it often does *thing*), not *word*, it would have been in the plural number, as *πραγματων* is, which relates to the same events, things so multifarious as

to include whatever Jesus did, or said, or suffered. 2dly, When the word *λογος*, in the fourth verse, is actually used in this meaning, having the same reference as *πραγμα* to the things accomplished, it is in the plural. *Λογος*, therefore, in the singular in this acceptation in the second verse, would not be more repugnant to propriety than to the construction both of the preceding part of the sentence and of the following. 3dly, I am as little satisfied as to the propriety of the word *υπηρεται* in that interpretation. *Υπηρετης* denotes properly *minister*, *servant*, or *agent*, employed by another in the performance of any work. But in what sense the Apostles or other disciples could be called *ministers* or *agents* in the much greater part of those events, whereof the Gospel gives us a detail, I have no conception. The principal things are what happened to our Lord, his miraculous conception and divine original, the manifest interposition of the Deity at his baptism and transfiguration, also his trial, death, resurrection, and ascension. In these surely they had no agency or ministry whatever. As to the miracles which he performed, and the discourses which he spoke; the most that can be said of the Apostles, is, that they saw the one, and heard the other. Nor could any little service in ordinary matters, such as distributing the loaves and fishes to the multitude, making preparation for the passover, or even the extraordinary powers by which they were enabled to perform some miracles, not recorded in the Gospels, entitle them to be styled *υπηρεται των πεπληροφορημενων εν ημιν πραγματων*, of which alone the Gospels are the histories; and for expressing their participation in the immediate effects of what they witnessed, the term *υπηρεται* appears to me quite unsuitable. So much for the rejection of that interpretation, though favoured by Gro. and Ham. My reasons for adopting the other are these: *The word of God, ο λογος του Θεου*, was, with Jews as well as Christians, a common expression for whatever God communicates to men for their instruction, whether doctrines or precepts. Thus our Lord, in explaining the parable of the sower, informs us that the seed denotes *the word of God, ο λογος του Θεου* (L. viii. 11.). In what follows in the explanation, and in the other Gospels, it is styled simply *the word*. Thus (Mr. iv. 14.), *Ο σπειρων τον λογον σπειρει*, *The sower*, which is explained to mean the preacher, *soweth the word*. Hence, among Christians, it came frequently to denote the Gospel, the last, and the best, revelation of God's will to men. Nor is this

idiom more familiar to any of the sacred writers than to L. See the following passages ; L. viii. 12, 13. 15. Acts, iv. 4. vi. 4. viii. 4. x. 44. xi. 19. xiv. 25. xvi. 6. xvii. 11. For brevity's sake, I have produced those places only wherein the abridged form, *ὁ λογος*, *the word*, is used as in the text. I cannot help observing that in one of the passages above quoted, Acts, vi. 4. the phrase is *ἡ διακονια του λογου*, *the ministry of the word*. This is mentioned as being eminently the business of the Apostles, and opposed to *διακονια τραπεζων*, *the service of tables*, an inferior sort of ministry, which was soon to be committed to a set of stewards elected for the purpose. Who knows not that *ὑπηρετης* and *διακονος* are, for the most part, in the Acts and Epistles, used indiscriminately for a minister of religion ? It is impossible, therefore, on reflection, to hesitate a moment in affirming, that the historian here meant to acquaint us, that he had received his information from those who had attended Jesus, and been witnesses of every thing during his public ministration upon the earth, and who, after his ascension, had been intrusted by him with the charge of propagating his doctrine throughout the world. *Auditors* first, *ministers* afterwards.

3. *Having exactly traced every thing, παρακολουθηκοτι πασιν ακριβως.* E. T. *Having had perfect understanding of all things.* The words in the original express more than is comprised in the common version. By the active verb *παρακολουθεω*, joined with the adverb *ακριβως*, are suggested his diligence and attention in procuring exact information, and not barely the effect, or that he actually possessed an accurate account of the whole. I agree with Maldonat, who says, “ Non scientiam his verbis, sed diligentiam suam commendat, quam in quærendis, vestigandis, explorandisque iis rebus adhibuerit quas scribere volebat.” The interpretation here given is also, in my judgment, more conformable to the import of the verb *παρακολουθεω* in other passages of the N. T. where it is spoken of persons. 1 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim. iii. 10. That L. was not, as Whitby supposes, an attendant on our Lord's ministry, the contrast, in the preceding verse, of *αυτοπται και ὑπηρεται*, *eye-witnesses and ministers*, to what he calls, in this verse, *παρακολουθηκως πασιν ακριβως*, clearly shows. Can we imagine that, by this less explicit phrase, he would have described the source of his own intelligence, had he been himself of the *αυτοπται και ὑπηρεται*.

There is, besides, in the preceding words, another contrast of the *αυτοπται* who gave the first testimony concerning Jesus, to those who received their testimony, in which latter class he includes himself, *παρεδοσαν ἑΜΙΝ δι' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αυτοπται*. Now, if it had not been his express purpose to rank himself among these; if he had meant to oppose the *αυτοπται* to those only who, from their information, had formerly undertaken narratives, the proper and obvious expression would have been, *καθως παρεδοσαν ΑΥΤΟΙΣ δι' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αυτοπται*.

² *To write a particular account to thee, καθεξῆς σοι γραψαι* E. T. *To write unto thee in order*. From the word *καθεξῆς* we cannot conclude, as some have hastily done, that the order of time is observed better by this, than by any other, Evangelist. The word *καθεξῆς* does not necessarily relate to time. See Acts xviii. 23. The proper import of it is *distinctly, particularly*, as opposed to *confusedly, generally*.

³ *Theophilus, Θεοφιλε*. It has been questioned whether this word is to be understood here as a proper name, or as an appellative. In the latter case, it ought to be rendered *lover of God*. But I prefer the former, which is the more usual, way of understanding it. For, 1st, If the Evangelist meant to address his discourse to all pious Christians, and had no one individual in view, I think he would have put his intention beyond all doubt, by using the plural number, and saying *κρατιστοι θεοφιλοι*. 2dly, This enigmatical manner of addressing all true Christians, under the appearance of bespeaking the attention of an individual, does not seem agreeable to the simplicity of style used in the Gospel, and must have appeared to the writer himself as what could not fail to be misunderstood by most readers, proper names of such a form as Theophilus, and even this very name, being common in Gr. and La. authors. 3dly, In the Scriptures, when *φιλος*, that is, *lover*, or *friend*, makes part of a compound epithet, it is always, if I mistake not, placed in the beginning, not the end, of the compound. The Apostle Paul, to express *lover of God*, says, *φιλοθεος* (2 Tim. iii. 4). There occur, also, in holy writ, several other compositions, after the same manner, of which this noun makes a part; as, *φιλαγαθος, φιλαδελφος, φιλαιδρος, φιλαιθρωπος, φιλαργυρος, φιλαντος, φιληδονος, φιλονεικος, φιλοξενος, φιλοσοφος, φιλοστοργος, φιλοτεκνος*. The other manner wherein *φιλος* is placed in the end, though not unexampled in clas-

sical writers, is much more uncommon. Lastly, What is said in the fourth verse evidently shows, that the author addressed himself to a person, with whose manner of being instructed in the Christian doctrine he was particularly acquainted.

* *Most excellent*, *κρατιστε*. Some consider this as an epithet, denoting the character of the person named, others as an honorary title, expressing respect to office or rank. I prefer the latter opinion. The word occurs only in three other places of the N. T. all in the acts of the Apostles, another work of the same hand. In these places, the title is manifestly given as a mark of respect to eminence of station. Accordingly it is only on Felix and Festus, when they were governors of the province, that we find it conferred. It is therefore not improbable that Theophilus has been the chief magistrate of some city of note in Greece or Asia Minor, and consequently intitled to be addressed in this respectful manner. For though Paul observes (1 Cor. i. 26.), that there were not many wise men after the flesh, not many rich, not many noble, in the Christian community, his expression plainly suggests that there were some. And, at the same time that we find the inspired penmen ready to show all due respect to magistracy, and to give honour, as well tribute, to whom it is due; no writers are less chargeable with giving flattering titles to men. Such appellations, therefore, as *αγαθε*, *βελτιστε*, *κρατιστε*, when they may be considered as adulatory or complimentary, however usual among the Greeks, do not suit the manner of the sacred writers. When Paul gave this title to Festus, it appears it was customary so to address the Roman presidents or procurators. In this manner we find Felix, who preceded Festus, was addressed, both by the military tribune Lysias, and by the orator Tertullus. Such titles are a mere piece of deference to the civil establishment, and imply dignity of function or rank, but no personal quality in the man to whom they are given. The same distinction, between official respect and personal, obtains amongst ourselves. Among so many *reverends*, it is, no doubt, possible to find some whose private character would entitle them to no *reverence*. And it will not, perhaps, be thought miraculous to meet with an *honourable*, on whom the principles of *honour* and honesty have little influence. The order of civil society requires a certain deference to office and rank, independently of the merit of the occupant, and a

proper attention in paying this deference, shows regard to the constitution of the country, and is of public utility, in more respects than one. But of those commendatory epithets, which are merely personal, these writers, alike untainted with fanaticism and flattery, are very sparing. They well knew, that where they are most merited, they are least coveted, or even needed. But, in a few ages afterwards, the face of things, in this respect, changed greatly. In proportion as men became more deficient in valuable qualities, they became more fond, and more lavish of fine words.

5. *Of the course of Abijah, ἐξ ἐφημερίας Αβια.* This was one of the twenty-four sacerdotal families into which the whole order was divided by David (1 Chron. xxiv. 3, &c.) and which served in the temple by turns.

9. *The sanctuary, τὸν ναόν.* E. T. *The temple.* Had the word been *το ἱερόν*, it could not have been rendered otherwise than *the temple*; but *ὁ ναός*, though commonly translated the same way, is not synonymous. The former comprehended the whole edifice, with all its enclosures, piazzas, and other buildings; the latter included only what was termed, by way of eminence, the house, consisting of the vestibule, the holy place or sanctuary, and the most holy. The altar of incense, on which the perfumes were burnt, was in the sanctuary: the people who were praying without, were in the temple, *ἐν τῷ ἱερώ*, in the court of Israel, though not in what was strictly called the house of God, that is, *ἐν τῷ ναῷ*. In order to render the version as explicit as the original, it behoves us to avoid confounding things in the one, which are not confounded in the other.

15. *Any fermented liquor, σιζερα.* E. T. *Strong drink.* Some think that by this name was meant a liquor made of dates, the fruit of the palm tree, a drink much used in the East. But I see no reason for confining the term to this signification. The word is Heb. שכר *shecher*, and has been retained by the Seventy interpreters in those passages where the law of the Nazarites is laid down, and in the rules to be observed by the priests, when it should be their turn to officiate in the temple. The Heb. root signifies *to ineborate*, or *make drunk*. All fermented liquors, therefore, as being capable of producing this effect, were understood as implied in the term. *Strong drink* is not the meaning. It might be impossible by words to define intelligibly the precise degree of strength forbidden, or for

judges to ascertain the transgression. For this reason the proper subject of positive law is kinds, not degrees in quality, whereof no standard can be assigned. For this reason, all liquors, however weak, which had undergone fermentation, were understood to be prohibited both to the Nazarites, and to the priests during the week wherein they officiated in the temple.

17. *And, by the wisdom of the righteous, to render the disobedient a people well-disposed for the Lord, και απειθεις, εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι Κυριω λαον κατεσκευασμενον.* E. T. *And the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.* The construction, in this way of rendering the words, must be *και επιστρεψαι απειθεις εν φρονησει δικαιων, ετοιμασαι λαον κατεσκευασμενον Κυριω.* I readily admit that *εν* in the N. T. is sometimes used, according to the Heb. idiom for *εις* or *επι*, and sometimes for *συν* or for *δια*; but this concession is not to be understood as implying, that such a use may happen equally in whatever way the words be connected. I question whether the verb *επιστρεψαι* will ever be found joined with the preposition *εν*, for expressing to turn to, or to convert to. It renders it the more improbable that this should be the case here, as in the preceding clause we find the verb *επιστρεψαι* followed by the preposition *επι*, for expressing this very idea, *turning to*, or *converting to*. That in two parallel and similar clauses, depending on the same verb, such an alteration should be made in the construction, is very improbable, being repugnant at once to simplicity, perspicuity, and propriety. It has some weight also, that as, in that explanation, the sentence has three clauses, though the first and the second are coupled by the conjunction *και*, there is no copulative prefixed to the third. This, at least, is unusual, and suits neither the Heb. idiom nor the Gr. In the way I understand the sentence, it has but two clauses. *Απειθεις* is not governed by *επιστρεψαι*, but by the following verb *ετοιμασαι*. The placing of a comma after *απειθεις* is all the change necessary in the pointing. This makes *εν φρονησει δικαιων* fall between two commas, and express the manner in which the Baptist was to effect those changes, namely, by inculcating that disposition of mind which, with righteous men, is the only genuine wisdom or prudence. Bishop Pearce has given the same turn to the sentence; only he seems to think that the word *δικαιων* peculiarly relates to John

himself. This supposition is quite unnecessary, and, as the word is in the plural number, embarrasses the construction. The wisdom of the righteous may well be understood as opposed to the wisdom of the ungodly, in like manner as the wisdom which is from above (another phrase for the same thing) is opposed to the wisdom which is from beneath.

23. *His days of officiating* : that is, his week (for it lasted no longer at one turn,) during which time he was not permitted to leave the precincts of the temple, or to have any intercourse with his wife.

28. *Favourite of Heaven*, *κεχαριτωμενη*. Vul. *Gratia plena*. There is no doubt that, in the sense wherein this last expression was used by Jerom, it was of the same import with that given here, after Dod. and with that used in the E. T. *thou art highly favoured*. But at present, the phrase *full of grace* would not convey the same meaning. Be. *Gratis dilecta*. This, though in strictness (if we consider only the import of the words taken severally) it may be defended, conveys an insinuation exceedingly improper and unjust. *Gratis dilecta* is precisely such a compellation as we should reckon suitable, had it been given to the woman whom our Lord permitted to anoint his feet in the house of Simon, to the great scandal of that Pharisee, who knew her former life. What might even but obliquely suggest a conception so remote from the scope of the Evangelist, ought carefully to be avoided.

² *The Lord be with thee*, *ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σου*. E. T. *The Lord is with thee*. Vul. Er. and Zu. *Dominus tecum*. Be. *Dominus tecum est*. As the substantive verb is not expressed in the original, it may be interpreted either in the indicative or in the optative. When rendered as an affirmation, we cannot question its truth. But it seems more suitable to the form of salutation, which is always expressive of good wishes, to understand it in the latter of these ways. The word *χαίρε*, which immediately precedes, suits this interpretation, and so did all the forms of saluting customary among the Hebrews, such as, *Peace be to this house* ; *the Lord be with you* ; and, *the Lord bless you*. See ch. x. 5. Ruth. ii. 4.

³ *Thou happiest of women*, *εὐλογημενη σὺ ἐν γυναιξιν*. E. T. *Blessed art thou among women*. I conceive this expression here

as more properly a compellation than either an affirmation or a salutation ; and I understand the pronoun as emphatical, and in the vocative. Such a phrase as *ευλογημενη εν γυναιξιν* is, in the Heb. idiom, an expression of the superlative. It is accordingly so rendered by Cas. in this place, *mulierum fortunatissima*. The same idiom is sometimes similarly used in the E. T. Thus, *ἡ καλη εν γυναιξιν* in the Sep. which is literally from the Heb. is, with us, *thou fairest among women*, Cant. i. 8. and *שׁוֹלֵי גִבּוֹר בְּבֵהֵמָה laish gibbor babbehmah, a lion, which is strongest among beasts*, Prov. xxx. 30. The expression used here by the Evangelist we find repeated, v. 42. ; but as it is coupled with another clause, *και ευλογημενος ο καρπος της κοιλιας σου* it must there be understood as an affirmation.

29. *At his appearance and words she was perplexed, ἡ δε ιδουσα, διεταραχθη επι τω λογω αυτου.* Vul. *Quæ cum audisset, turbata est in sermone ejus.* This version would appear to have sprung from a different reading ; yet there is no known reading that is entirely conformable to it. The Cam. and two other MSS. omit *ιδουσα*. Si. thinks that the Vul. fully expresses the meaning of the original, and that the Evangelist, in saying *ιδουσα*, has, by a trope not unusual with the sacred authors, expressed the operation of one of our senses by a term which, in strictness, belongs to another. I admit, that there are examples of this kind, but I see no occasion for recurring to them here. It cannot be questioned that such an extraordinary appearance, as well as the words spoken, would contribute to affect the mind of the Virgin with apprehension and fear.

35. *The holy progeny, το γεννωμενον αγιον.* E. T. *That holy thing which shall be born of thee.* Vul. *Quod nascetur ex te sanctum.* This is one of the few instances in which our translators have deserted the common Gr. and preferred the present reading of the Vul. There are indeed four MSS. only one of them of note, and the first Sy. with some other versions, which concur with the Vul. in reading *ex σου* after *το γεννωμενον*. But though this is the reading of the authorised editions of the Vul. it is not the reading of most MS. copies. Some of the Fathers read these words in some MSS. and attempted to account for the omission of them, in the much greater number, by imputing it to the Eutychians and other

heretics, who (they would have us believe) expunged them, because unfavourable to their errors. But it is far more probable that the orthodox, or ruling party, who were as chargeable with frauds of this sort as any heretics, should have had it in their power to foist the words in question into four or five copies, which are all as yet found to have them, than that any sectaries should have had it in their power to expunge them out of more than fifty times that number, in which they are wanting. As the sense is complete without them, the greater number of copies, especially where the difference in number is so considerable, ought to determine the point. Wet. suspects, and not implausibly, that the inserted words have been transferred hither from Gal. iv. 4. As there is nothing in the words themselves that is not strictly conformable to truth, it is easy to assign a reason why some modern editors, and even translators, have thought it more eligible to insert than to omit them. In such cases, this will be found the most common way of deciding.

37. *Nothing is impossible with God, ουκ αδυνατηται παρα τω Θεω παν ρημα.* Vul. *Non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum.* Diss. IX. P. II. § 9.

45. *Happy is she who believed, μακαρια η πιστευσασα.* Vul. *Beata quæ credidisti.* In like manner Cas. *Beatam te quæ credideris.* A little after, in the same verse, both have *tibi*, where in the original it is *αυτη*. Agreeable to these is the Sax. This expression of the sentiment, by the second person instead of the third, seems peculiar to these translators, but does not affect the sense.

² *That the things which the Lord hath promised her shall be performed, οτι εσται τελειωσις τοις λελαλημενοις αυτη παρα Κυριου.* E. T. *For there shall be a performance of those things, which were told her from the Lord.* Vul. *Quoniam perficientur ea quæ dicta sunt tibi a Domino.* To the same purpose Be. *Nam consummabuntur ea quæ dicta sunt ei a Domino.* Cas. differently, *Perfectum iri quæ tibi a Domino significata sunt.* The instances in the N. T. wherein *οπι* does not signify *because*, but *that*, are very many. The understands it so in this place. So also does Gro. and some other expositors of name. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that the words are susceptible of either interpretation. The reasons which have induced me to prefer the latter are the fol-

lowing. After πιστευω, when a clause is subjoined representing the thing believed, it is invariably introduced by οτι, which in those cases cannot be rendered otherwise than *that*. See Mt. ix. 28. Mr. xi. 23, 24. J. xi. 27. 42. xiii. 19. xiv. 10, 11. xvi. 27. 30. xvii. 8. 21. xx. 31. I have, for the sake of brevity, referred only to examples which occur in the Gospels. 2dly, The person or subject believed is always subjoined, unless there be something in the preceding words which show clearly what it is. Now there is nothing here in the preceding words which can suggest what was believed. It is then highly probable, that it is contained in the words succeeding. 3dly, That this clause expresses, not the reward of belief, but the thing believed, is probable from this consideration, that Elizabeth had doubtless in view the superiority of Mary, above her own husband Zacharias, inasmuch as the former readily believed the heavenly messenger, which the latter did not. Now, if Elizabeth meant to point out the superior felicity of Mary, on account of her faith, she would never have specified a circumstance which happened equally to her who believed, and to him who did not believe; for to both there was a performance of those things which had been told them from the Lord. It would have been rather inopportune to mention this circumstance as the special reward of her faith, though very apposite to subjoin it as the subject.

³ Some have thought that the words παρα Κυριου, in the end, are better connected with τελειωσις, and that, therefore, τοις λελαλημενοις αυτη should be included between commas. When the effect is equal in respect of the sense, the simplest manner of construing the sentence ought to be preferred. Admitting then, that παδα Κυριου may be properly conjoined either with τελειωσις, or with λελαλημενοις αυτη, it is preferable to adopt the construction which suits the order of the words, where there is no special reason for deserting that order. The phrase, *things spoken or promised to her*, does not necessarily imply that it was the Lord who spoke them, even though he be mentioned as the author of the events; but, in speaking of the performance of things promised by the Lord, it is manifestly implied, that the Lord hath performed them. A promise is performed only by the promiser. This is, therefore, better, as it is a fuller expression of what is admitted on all sides to be the meaning. One would almost think of some critics, that they dislike an exposi-

tion, because it is obvious, and prefer one palpably worse, which requires some transposition of the words. To transpose the words is sometimes necessary in explaining these writings, but the presumption is always against the transposition, when the words, as they lie, yield as good and as pertinent a meaning.

49. *Whose name is venerable, και άγιον το ονομα αυτου.* Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9, &c.

51. *Dispelleth the vain imaginations of the proud, διεσκορπισεν υπερηφανους διανοια καρδιας αυτων.* E. T. *He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.* Gro. justly observes that this is a figurative manner of expressing, *He scattereth the proud, as to what concerns the thoughts of their hearts; that is, their vain imaginations.* “Dissipavit superbos quod consilia cordis ipsorum attinet.” Maldonat says, to the same purpose, “Dispersit superbos mente cordis sui, pro dispersit cogitationes cordis superborum, id est, ipsorum consilia et machinationes.” With the Hellenist Jews it is not unusual in such canticles to express general truths or observations, which have no relation to any particular time, by the aorist. See the song of Hannah, 1 Sam. ii. 1, &c. in the Sep. version, which bears a resemblance to this of Mary. I have, in this version employed the present, as better suited to the genius of our language.

54, 55. *He supported Israel his servant (as he promised to our fathers,) ever inclined to mercy towards Abraham and his race, αντελαβετο Ισραελ παιδος αυτου, μνησθηναι ελεους (καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων) τω Αβρααμ και τω σπερματι αυτου εις τον αιωνα.* E. T. *He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.* There can hardly be a reasonable doubt that there is, in this passage, an infringement of the natural order. Such a construction as *ελαλησε προς τους πατερας, τω Αβρααμ*, is, to the best of my remembrance, unexampled in these writings. All the correction in the pointing necessary in Gr. for avoiding this singular construction, is very simple. If we include *καθως ελαλησε προς τους πατερας ημων* in a parenthesis, the apparent solecism is totally removed. But the irregular syntax in the sentence, as commonly read, which has often been remarked by the critics, is not the only objection to it. The expression is not agreeable to the style of Scripture on those subjects. In relation to the promises, God is very often said, in general, to have spoken to the fathers, or, in par-

ticalar, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; but never to Abraham and his posterity. That those promises concern the posterity is plain, and is often mentioned : but it is nowhere said that they were spoken to them. The very addition of the words *for ever*, *εις τον αιωνα*, shows the same thing, to wit, that their connexion is not with *ελαλησε*, but with *μνησθηναι ελεους*. Some editors, sensible of this, though not sensible of the irregularity of the construction, as the passage is commonly interpreted, or of the impropriety of the expression now taken notice of, have included all between *ελεους* and *εις τον αιωνα* in a parenthesis. These, by their manner of departing from the order of the words in the explanation they give of them, make a still greater stretch, and a longer suspension of the sense, to less purpose.

² *To remember mercy* is not an unfrequent Oriental idiom, for expressing to incline to mercy, to be merciful. See Ps. xcviij 3. cix. 16. Hab. iij. 2.

64. *And his mouth was opened directly, and his tongue loosed*, *ανεωχθη δε το στομα παραχημα και η γλωσσα αυτου*. In adding the word *loosed*, I have followed the common translation. The genius of modern tongues does not always permit the freedom used by the ancients. - But it sometimes happens that, in attempting to escape one difficulty, a person runs, before he is aware, into a greater. Elsnor was so struck with the incongruity (as it appeared to him) of the application of *ανεωχθη* to *γλωσσα*, that, in order to avoid it, he has attempted to construe the sentence in a quite different manner, making one clause to end with the word *παραχημα*, and making the noun *γλωσσα* the nominative to the following verb *ελαλει*. The subsequent member of the sentence, according to him stands thus, *και η γλωσσα αυτου και ελαλει ευλογων τον Θεον*. Passing the objections to which the form of the expression is liable (for the examples he produces, in support of his hypothesis, are far from being similar,) it is strange that a man of his knowledge and discernment did not discover that *γλωσσα ευλογων* was incomparably more exceptionable than the expression against which he objected. Raphelius and others have given the most convincing evidence, that such idioms as a verb joined to two nouns, related in meaning to each other, to one of which alone the verb is strictly applicable, are warranted by the most approved classical authority in prose and verse.

The *σιτον και οινον εδοντες* of Homer is well known. Nor does that of the Apostle greatly differ. *Γαλα υμας εποτισα και ου βρωμα*, which is literally in Eng. *I made you drink milk and not meat*, 1 Cor. iii. 2. This sounds rather more harshly to us than the literal version of the text under examination. *Then were opened his mouth and his tongue*. But we see that even critics, sometimes, rather than acknowledge in the sacred penmen a negligence of expression, not without example in the best writers, will find it necessary to admit a blunder hardly to be met with in the worst.

67. *Propheesied, προεφητευσε*. I have retained the word; though, in the Jewish idiom, *to prophesy* admits of several senses. Amongst others, it often means to express the devout sentiments to which a particular occurrence gives rise, in such a song of praise as that which he has subjoined. It must be owned, however, that, in this canticle, there are some things which, in strict propriety, are prophetic, according to the acceptation of the term *prophecy*, in our language. This is an additional reason for retaining the word in this place.

69, 70, 71. *And (as anciently he promised by his holy Prophets) hath raised a Prince for our deliverance, in the house of David his servant; for our deliverance from our enemies, and from the hands of all who hate us—και εγειρε ζερας σωτηριας ημιν εν τω οικω Δαβιδ του παιδος αυτου καθως ελαλησε δια στοματος των αγιων των απ' αιωνος προφητων αυτου, σωτηριαν εξ εχθρων ημων και εκ χειρος παντων των μισουντων ημας*. E. T. *And he hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us*. All such Scripture songs, as that from which these words are taken, are expressed in the Oriental poetic idiom, resembling that of the Psalms. Now, it is impossible to render these into another language, with tolerable clearness and propriety, without using greater latitude of expression than is necessary in translating plain prose. For this reason, I have taken the freedom to make here a small alteration in the arrangement. The 70th verse is a parenthesis; and, that the interruption which it gives to the meaning may, as little as possible, hurt perspicuity, I have introduced it immediately after *and*, in the beginning

of v. 69. In consequence of this transposition, the verb *εγειρε* is more closely connected with its regimen *σωτηριαν*. I have also preferred the proper term, to the trope, in the translation of *κερας*. *Horn of salvation*, is both too obscure, and too little suited to our mode of speaking, to be fit for admission into modern languages. When there can be no doubt about the meaning, a translator ought not anxiously to trace figures which do not suit the language he is writing. Often a metaphor, which has energy, and even elegance, in one tongue, is both dark and uncouth in another. For the greater clearness, I have also rendered *ελαλησε*, *promised*, a sense which it often has in the prophetic writings.

75. *In piety and uprightness, εν οσιοτητι και δικαιοσυνη ενωπιον αυτου*. The two last words *ενωπιον αυτου*, *before him*, that is, God, are a common Hebraism, to denote that the virtues mentioned are genuine, as under the eye of God.

78. *Who hath caused a light to spring from on high to visit us, εν οίς επεσχεψατο ημας ανατολη εξ υψους*, E. T. *Whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us*. The *day-spring* is an expression rather indefinite. If it mean *the dawn*, it is too faint an image for the subject. It has been observed by critics, that *ανατολη* is the word used by the Sep. in rendering the Heb. *צמח* *tsemoch*, which signifies *a branch*, or a young shoot, a name by which the Messiah appears to have been denominated by some of the Prophets. The word *ανατολη* is also used sometimes to denote *the sun-rising*; lastly, it signifies the East, or the quarter of the heavens in which he rises. That it does not, in this place, answer to *branch*, the reason urged by Gro. Ham. and other commentators, is sufficient evidence. It is not natural to speak of sending a branch, to enlighten those who are in darkness, or to direct their feet in the way. If the sun, as he appears in rising, had been here alluded to, *ανατολη* would not have been without the article. Besides, it is so far justly argued, by Wet. that the rising sun cannot be here understood by *ανατολη*, because the sun, when he rises, is always in the horizon; whereas this light is spoken of as coming from on high, *εξ υψους*, and must, therefore, be rather vertical than horizontal. Now, the word *ανατολη*, imports not only *oriens*, but *ortus*; and is alike applicable to any light newly sprung up, or appearing. This sense of the word I have adopted here, and endeavoured to express with perspicuity.

CHAPTER II.

1. *All the inhabitants of the empire, τασαν την οικουμενην.* E. T. *All the world.* Vul. *Universus orbis.* *Οικουμενη* means, strictly, the inhabited part of the earth, and therefore, *πασα η οικουμενη*, *all the world*, in the common acceptation of the phrase. But it is well known, that this expression was, in ancient times, frequently employed to denote *the Roman empire*. It has, probably, been a title first assumed by the Romans, through arrogance, afterwards given by others, through flattery, and at last appropriated, by general use, to this signification. That it has a more extensive meaning, in this place, is not, I think, pretended by any. But there are some who, on the contrary, would confine it still further, making it denote no more than Judea and its appendages, or all that was under the dominion of Herod. Of this opinion are several of the learned, Binæus, Beau. Dod. Lardner, Pearce, and others. In support of it, they have produced some passages, in which this phrase, or expressions equivalent, appear to have no larger signification. Admitting their explanation of the passages they produce, they are not parallel to the example in hand. Such hyperboles are indeed current, not only in the language of the Evangelists, but in every language. In those cases, however, wherein they are introduced, there rarely fails to be something, either in what is spoken, or in the occasion of speaking, which serves to explain the trope. For example; the term, *a country*, in English, denotes, properly a region or tract of land inhabited by a people living under the same government, and having the same laws. By this, which is the common acceptation, we should say that England is *a country*. Yet the term is often used without any ambiguity, in a more limited sense. Thus, to adopt a familiar illustration: An inhabitant of a country town, or parish, says to one of his neighbours, speaking of a young man and a young woman of their acquaintance, “All the country says that they are soon to be married;” yet so far is he from meaning, by the phrase, *all the country*, all the people of England, that he is sensible that not a thousandth part of them knows that such persons exist. He means no more than *all the village*, or *all the neighbourhood*. Nor is he in the smallest danger in speaking thus.

of being misunderstood by any hearer. Every body perceives that, in such cases, the phrase has a greater or less extent of meaning, according to the sphere of the persons spoken of. But if, on the other hand, he should say, "The parliament has laid a tax on saddle-horses throughout all the country;" nobody could imagine that less than England were intended by the term *country*, in this application. Here the term must be considered as it stands related to parliament; in other words, it must be that which, in the style of the legislature, would be named *the country*. In like manner, though it might not be extraordinary that a Jew, addressing himself to Jews, and speaking of their own people only, should employ such a hyperbolé as *all the world*, for all Judea, it would be exceedingly unnatural in him, and, therefore, highly improbable that he should use the same terms, applied in the same manner, in relating the resolves and decrees of the Roman emperor, to whom all Judea would be very far from appearing all the world, or even a considerable part of it. In reporting the orders given by another, especially a sovereign, the reporter is presumed to convey the ideas, and even, as nearly as possible, the words, of the person or sovereign of whom he speaks. Some have, not improbably, supposed, for it is in the manner of exact narrators, that the words *απογραφεσθαι την οικουμενην*, were the words of the emperor's edict, and copied thence by the Evangelist. I shall only add, that the Sy. interpreter, as all the other ancient interpreters, understood the words in the same manner, *כלה צמא ראוהרנה*, *all the people of his* (the emperor's) *dominions*. I am not insensible, that this opinion is liable to objections, from the silence of historians and the improbability of the thing: and though these objections do not appear to me so formidable, as they do to some others, the examination of them, severally, would lead into a length of discussion but ill suited to my design. I shall, therefore, only add, in general, that, for my own part, I should have less scruple in admitting that, about a point of this kind, the extent of the emperor's edict (which nowise affects the faith of a Christian,) the writer might have mistaken, or been misinformed, than in giving such forced meanings, and unnatural construction, to his words, as tend but too manifestly to unsettle all language, and render every thing in words ambiguous and doubtful. May not that be here called *an edict*,

which was no more than a *declared purpose*, a purpose too not to be executed at once, but gradually, as circumstances would permit ?

² *Should be registered*, ἀπογραφεσθαι. E. T. *Should be taxed*. Vul. and Be. *Describeretur*. Er. Zu. and Cas. *Censeretur*. Our translators have, in this instance, not so properly, in my opinion, preferred the three last. ἀπογραφεσθαι is, strictly, *to be registered*, or *enrolled* ; αποπιμασθαι, *to be taxed*. Almost all the modern translations I have seen, into Itn. Fr. or Eng. have adopted the former interpretation. As the *register* was commonly made with a view to *taxing* ; it may, no doubt, in many cases, be, with sufficient propriety, rendered in the manner our translators, and others, have done. However, as, in this place, there is some difficulty, it is better to adhere strictly to the import of the words. Though it was commonly for the purpose of taxing that a register was made, it was not always, or necessarily so. In the present case, we have ground to believe, that there was no immediate view to taxation, at least with respect to Judea. Herod (called the great) was then alive, and king of the country, and though in subordination to the Romans, of whom he may justly be said to have held his crown ; yet, as they allowed him all the honours of royalty, there is no ground to think that either, in his life-time, or, before the banishment of his son Archelaus, the Romans would directly, by their own officers, levy any toll or tribute from the people of Judea. Nay, we have the testimony of the Jewish historian Josephus, that they did not till after the expulsion of Archelaus, when the country was annexed to Syria, and so became part of a Roman province. But it may appear an objection to this account, that it should be considered in an imperial edict as a part, in any respect, of the Roman empire ; and that one should be sent, by the emperor, into the country, to make an enrollment of the people. To this I answer, that as to the name οὐκουμένη, though it has been shown, that it was commonly employed to denote the Roman empire, we ought not to interpret the name *empire* too rigidly, as confined to the provinces under the immediate dominion of Rome. It may well be understood to comprehend all the countries tributary to, or dependent on Rome. Now, there is one important purpose that such registers, even where no tax was imposed, were well fitted to answer ; they enabled those haughty lords of the world to know the state of their dependencies, and to

form a judgment both as to the sums of money which might be reasonably exacted from their respective princes, and as to the number of soldiers which might be obtained in case of war. Nor is it at all improbable, that when a census was making of the empire, properly so called, the enrollment of the families might be extended to Judea, with a view to the exaction of an oath of fidelity, as Wet. supposes, founding his opinion on a passage of Josephus, and with no design of taxing the country then. Yet the register taken at that time, might be afterwards used by the Romans, for assisting them in levying a tax.

2. *This first register took effect when Cyrenius was president of Syria, ἀντὴ ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο, ἡγεμονευόντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. E. T. And this taxing was first made, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. Vul. Hæc descriptio prima facta est a præside Syriæ Cyrino.* About the import of this verse, there is a great diversity of opinions among the critics. Yet, when we attend to it, as it lies, without taking into consideration the knowledge we derive from another quarter, we should hardly think there were a verse in the Gospel about which there is less scope for doubt. That which has principally given rise to the questions that have been agitated on this subject, is a passage in Josephus (Ant. b. 18. c. 1.), from which it appears, that the tax levied by Cyrenius, which was the first imposed on the people by the Romans, happened about ten or eleven years after the time here spoken of by L.; for, according to Josephus, it was after the expulsion of Archelaus, when Judea was reduced to the condition of a Roman province. As, at the time when that historian wrote, the event was both recent and memorable, it having given birth to an insurrection under Judas of Gallilee, which though soon quelled to appearance, became the latent source of a war, that ended in the ruin of the nation; it is impossible to think that that historian could either have erred through ignorance, or have attempted wilfully to misrepresent what must have been known to thousands then living. We cannot, therefore, with Maldonat, and others, cut short the matter at once, by sacrificing the credit of the historian to the authority of the Evangelist; because this will be found, in the issue, to do a material injury to the Evangelist himself. Let us try, then, whether, without doing violence to the words of Scripture, which, in cases of this kind, is too often done, we can explain them, so as not to be inconsistent

with the account given by the historian. And, first, as to the attempts which have been made by others, with the same view ; it is hardly necessary to mention, that some are for extirpating this verse altogether, as an interpolation. This is an expeditious method of getting rid of a difficulty, which I am sorry to see some learned men, in this age, so ready to adopt ; though, it must be owned, this expedient tends very much to shorten the critic's labour. But it is a sufficient answer to this, that it is a mere hypothesis, and, I will add, a most licentious hypothesis, inasmuch as it is not pretended, that there is a single MS. or edition, ancient translation, or commentary, in which the verse is wanting. When the thing, therefore, is properly viewed, we have here a cloud of witnesses, numerous and venerable, the same by whom the Gospel itself is attested to us, in opposition to a mere possibility. Of the same kind is the substitution of Saturninus or Quintilius for Cyrenius. Others, more moderate, attempt to remove the difficulty by a different interpretation of the passage, rendering it, after The. *This register was made before Cyrenius was governor of Syria* ; and, for this sense and application of the superlative *πρωτος*, for the comparative *πρωτερος*, examples are quoted from the Gospel of J. Thus, *πρωτος μου ην*, *He was before me*. J. i. 15. 30. and *εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν*, *It hated me before it hated you*, xv. 18. For some time past, this solution of the difficulty appears to have been the most favoured by interpreters, both abroad and at home. Now, there are several considerations which oppose the admission of such an idiom in the present case. First, among the sacred writers, it seems to be peculiar to the Evangelist J. Nothing similar is found in this Gospel or the Acts, both written by L. nor in any other writer of the N. T. I see no reason to consider it as an Hellenistic idiom, being without example in the Sep. Nor can it be called Oriental, as the Orientals have neither comparatives nor superlatives, but express the meaning of both by periphrasis. Secondly, The expressions are not similar. In such anomalous phrases, the discovery of the sense depends on the strictest observance of the arrangement. *Πρωτος*, in the instances quoted, is immediately prefixed, like a preposition, to the word it governs : thus, *πρωτος μου*, *πρωτον υμων*,—whereas here, it is separated from the word governed, *Κυρηνιου*, both by the verb *εγενετο*, and by other terms intervening. Thirdly, If the Evange-

list meant to tell us that this register was prior to another taken by Cyrenius, he ought to have said *πρωτη της [απογραφης] Κυρηνιου*. And if he meant to tell us that it was before Cyrenius was governor, he ought to have said, either *πρωτη του ηγεμονευειν Κυρηνιου*, or *πρωτη της ηγεμονιας Κυρηνιου*. In no case, therefore, can the examples quoted from J. serve to authorize a construction every way so irregular as this of L. is, on their hypothesis. I will add, fourthly, that, in regard to the quotations from J. though the expression is not strictly grammatical, it has that simplicity and plainness which warrant us to affirm, that it readily suggests the meaning to every attentive reader. With respect to this passage of L. we may justly affirm the reverse, that no person ever did, or could imagine the interpretation devised, who had not previously heard of an inconsistency which the obvious interpretation bore to the report of the Jewish historian, and who was not in quest of something, in the way of explanation, which might reconcile them. The hypothesis of the learned and indefatigable Dr. Lardner, to whose labours the Christian world is so highly indebted, is not without its difficulties. But of this presently.

² *Ηγεμονευοντος—Κυρηνιου*. There are two questions to which this participle gives rise; one concerning the import of the word *ηγεμων*; the other concerning the intention of the participial form *ηγεμονευοντος* here employed. As to the first, it is evident that *ηγεμων*, in the language of the N. T. is not peculiarly appropriated to the president of a province, but is used with a good deal of latitude, being given also to the imperial procurators, such as Pontius Pilate, and even to the prefects, who had the principal charge of any business. It is in this sense, perhaps, that it is here applied to Cyrenius (or, as Tacitus calls him, Quirinius,) who certainly was not, in Herod's lifetime, president or governor of Syria. But, on this point, I do not find any difference amongst interpreters. As to the second, it is made a question, whether *ηγεμονευοντος* ought to be understood as the genitive absolute of the participle, and, consequently, as intended to express the time when the event mentioned took place; or, as equivalent to the appellative *ηγεμων*, and serving merely as a title derived from an office, which Cyrenius, some time or other, either before or after, possessed, and being in the genitive, as agreeing with *Κυρηνιου*, which is governed by *απογραφη*. Those

who construe the sentence in this manner, render it thus : *This was the first assessment of Cyrenius governor of Syria.* It is this mode of interpretation, which has been adopted by Lardner, as to which I beg leave to offer to the reader's consideration the following reflections. It cannot be doubted the participle present often supplies the place of an appellative ; but, in such cases, if I remember right, it is the uniform practice to distinguish it by the article. Thus it is : *ὁ βαπτίζων, ὁ πειραζων, ὁ αναγινασκων, οἱ οικοδομοντες, οἱ κυριευοντες.* On the contrary, when the participle is used as a participle, and particularly, when it is in the genitive absolute, it has not the article. Should it be argued, that it must, nevertheless, be a noun in this place, because it governs the genitive, and not the case of the verb ; I answer, that the same circumstance (not unusual in Gr.) takes place in all the examples shortly to be produced, as to which, there never was any doubt that the words were to be understood merely as participles in the genitive absolute. Secondly, no way can be more proper for attaining the sense of an author, in places where it may be doubtful, than by comparing those with similar expressions in other places of that author, about which all interpreters are agreed. Now, there cannot be a greater similarity in construction, than that which the beginning of the following chapter bears to the verse under examination : *Ἡγεμορευοντος Ποντιου Πιλατου της Ιουδαιας, και τετραρχουντος της Γαλιλαιας Ἡρωδου, Φιλιππου δε του αδελφου αυτου τετραρχουντος της Ιτουραιας και Τραχωνιτιδος χωρας, και Ανθωνιου της Αβιληνης τετραρχουντος —εγενετο ρημα Θεου επι Ιωαννην.* There cannot be a greater coincidence in syntax, than there is in the two passages now compared, inasmuch that, if there be no ambiguity in the original of the passage quoted (and I have never heard it said that there is,) neither is there (notwithstanding the learned doctor's remark) any ambiguity in the original of the passage under examination. The similarity, in both, is striking, upon the slightest attention. The present participles in the genitive, without the article, the first of these participles, *ἡγεμορευοντος*, the same in both, and all of these governing the genitive, and not the accusative, the occasion of introducing these circumstances also similar. Now, it was never questioned that the participles in the beginning of the third chapter, are merely participles in the genitive absolute, employed solely for ascertaining the time when John's ministry commenced. I shall bring another example from the same au-

thor, which is also similar in every circumstance, (Acts xviii. 12.) ; *Γαλλίωνος δε ἀνθυπατευόντος τῆς Ἀχαΐας, κατεπεβίησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ*— *When Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection against Paul.* This is no Hellenistic idiom of the Evangelist, it is perfectly classical ; *ὑπατευόντων* being often used by the Gr. writers of Roman affairs, as corresponding to *consulibus* in La. for marking, by the names of the consuls in office, the date of an event or transaction mentioned. The remark, therefore, that names of office, and participles supplying the place of such names, do not always imply that the office was possessed at the very time to which the action or event refers, though certainly true, is not applicable to the case in hand. The words, expressed in the precise manner above explained, can be neither names of office, nor introduced for the purpose of supplying such names, but participles of the present, specially intended for fixing the circumstance of time. I cannot, therefore, admit this hypothesis of Lardner (though at first inclinable to it,) without infringing the common rules of Syntax, and doing injury to the manner of the sacred writer ; I may rather say, to his meaning, manifestly shown, from instances in other places entirely similar. Further, had it been the Evangelist's intention to signify that the register was made by Cyrenius, the proper expression would have been *ὑπο Κυρηνίου* ; for, in that case, it would have clearly been (what it must have been the writer's intention to represent it) the register only of the empire *τῆς οἰκουμένης*, executed by Cyrenius. One would think that the author of the Vul. had found the preposition in the Gr. MS. he used, as we read, in his translation, *a præside Syriæ Cyrino*. But some critics of the La. Church, particularly Maldonat, reject the preposition as interpolated. Si. evidently suspects it, and observes that, in the margin of some MS. La. Bibles, it is corrected in the notes called *correctoria*. Now, as this reading has no countenance from Gr. MSS. ancient commentaries, or printed editions, it is entitled to no regard. And, if it were, the only difference it would make on the sentence is this : the present reading implies no more, than that the event happened during the presidency of Cyrenius, the other would denote also that it was done by him ; for *ἡγεμονειόντος*, without the article, would still be a participle, and not a noun.

³ On all these accounts, I approve more the way suggested by Wet. for removing the difficulty, by the explanation of the verb *εγενετο*, than by putting the construction to the torture, to wrest a meaning from the sentence which otherwise it would never yield. It is certain, that the verb *γινεσθαι* has, in the N. T. other senses, beside the most common ones, *to be, to become, to be made, to be born, to happen*. And of those other meanings, less usual, but sufficiently warranted, the most applicable here is, *to take effect, to produce its ordinary consequences*. An example of this sense we have, Mt. v. 18. *εως αν παρελθη ο ουρανος και η γη, ιωτα εν η μια κεραια ου μη παρελθη απο του νομου εως αν παντα γενηται* : rendered in this version : *Sooner shall heaven and earth perish, than one iota, or one tittle of the law shall perish, without attaining its end*. The last clause is to the same purpose in the E. T. *Till all be fulfilled*. From the connexion of the verse with that immediately preceding, it is evident that the verb *γινεσθαι* is used in the one, in the same sense with *πληρωσθαι* in the other : *ουκ ηλθον καταλυσαι αλλα πληρωσθαι*. For the import of the word *πληρωσθαι* in that passage, see the note in this version. We have another example in the same Gospel, vi. 10. *νηθητω το θελημα σου, Thy will be done* ; that is, *take effect, be executed*. The same phrase occurs also, xxvi. 42. L. xi. 2. and nearly the same, xxii. 42. *μη το θελημα μου, αλλα το σου γενεσθω*. Again, Mt. xviii. 19. our Lord, speaking of the request which two or three of his disciples shall agree in making, says, *γενησεται αυτοις*, it shall be accomplished for them, it shall have the desired effect. I shall produce but one other example, 1 Cor. xv. 54. *τοτε γενησεται λογος ο γεγραμμενος, Κατεποθη ο θανατος εις νικος* : *Then that saying of Scripture shall be accomplished, Death is swallowed up of victory*. Now, let it be remarked that, in the most common acceptation of the verb *γινομαι*, a law is made, *γινεται*, when it is enacted, not when it is obeyed ; a request, when it is presented, not when it is granted ; a promise, when it is given, not when it is performed ; a prediction, when it is announced, not when it is fulfilled. Yet it is in the latter only, though less common meaning, that the verb, in all the instances above produced, is, by the concurrent voice of all interpreters, to be understood. There is only one small point in which this solution appears to differ from that given by Wet. He, if I mistake not, retains the ordinary meaning of the verb *γινομαι*, and, in defence of the expression, ar-

gues, that it is usual to speak of a thing as done by that person by whom it was finished, although it had been begun and carried on by others. But to say that a business enjoined so early by Augustus, was performed so long after by Cyrenius, or during his government, gives immediate scope for the question, 'Where was, then, the necessity that Joseph should make a journey to Bethlehem, to be registered, with Mary his espoused wife, ten or eleven years before?' And even if it should be expressed that the business was at that time completed, it might seem strange that, in a country no larger than Judea, the execution of this order should have required so long a time. In the way I have rendered it, both objections are obviated: the register (whatever was the intention of it) was made in Herod's time, but had then little or no consequences. When, after the deposition and banishment of Archelaus, Judea was annexed to Syria, and converted into a province, the register of the inhabitants, formerly taken, served as a directory for laying on the *census*, to which the country was then subjected. Not but that there must have happened considerable changes on the people during that period. But the errors which these changes might occasion could, with proper attention, be easily rectified. And thus, it might be justly said, that an enrolment which had been made several years before, did not take effect, or produce consequences worthy of notice, till then. This solution does not differ, in the result, from that given by Whiston, and approved by Prideaux, but it differs in the method of educing the conclusion, amongst other objections to which Whiston's method is exposed, one is, that if the sense of *απογραθη* had been as unconnected with that of the verb *απογραφομαι*, in the preceding verse, as he makes it, the historian would not have introduced it with the demonstrative pronoun, and said, *Αυτη η απογραφη*, which plainly refers us, for its meaning, to the verb, its conjugate, he had immediately used. This, upon the whole, is my opinion of this puzzling question. It is, however, proper to observe, that I offer it only as what appears to me a plausible way of solving the difficulty, without violating the syntax; but am far from having that confidence in it wherewith some critics express themselves concerning solutions which, to speak moderately, are not less exceptionable.

7. *Laid him in a manger*, ανεκλιεν αυτον εν τη φατνη. Bishop Pearce is of opinion, that by the word φατνη is here meant a bag of coarse cloth, like those out of which the horses of our troopers are fed when encamped. This bag he supposes to have been fastened to the wall, or some other part, not of the stable, but of the guest-chamber, or room for the reception of strangers, where Joseph and Mary were lodged, in which guest-chamber, intended solely for accommodating human creatures, and not cattle, there was a manger, but there was no bed; and this obliged Mary to have recourse to the manger for laying her child in. What could have led a man of Dr. Pearce's abilities to adopt an hypothesis so ill compacted, as well as unsupported, it is not easy to conceive. Perhaps a strong prejudice against the notion that the mother of our Lord should, on that occasion, have had no better accommodation than what a stable could afford. But in all such cases, the reflection ought ever to be present to our minds, that what we are inquiring into is not a matter of theory, but a point of fact; concerning the evidence of which, we shall never be capable of judging with impartiality, if we have allowed our minds to be pre-occupied with vain conceptions, in relation to fitness and dignity, of which we are not competent judges. If, along with sufficient evidence of the fact, there be nothing that contradicts the manifest principles of the understanding, or shocks that sense of right and wrong, which is the law of God written on our hearts, we ought to be satisfied. For that there should be things astonishing, or even unaccountable, in transactions so far superior to every other object of our meditations, is what we ought in reason to expect, ever remembering, that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are our ways his ways. Mr. Harmer, [see Observations vol. i. p. 442. ed. 2d.] says, that as the horses in the East eat chiefly barley, they do not eat it out of a manger, as with us (for they have no mangers,) but out of bags of haircloth, which are hung about their heads for that purpose. From this observation of Bishop Pearce's, Dr. Priestley has drawn a conclusion, in a great measure the reverse, to wit, that they were all in a stable, but that there is no mention of a manger of any kind, the word φατνη, on his hypothesis, meaning only *stable*. That the word φατνη means *stable*, or rather *stall*, as well as *manger*, is admitted. *Manger* seems to have been the original signification, and the other meaning, *stall*, to have arisen from a

synecdoche of a part for the whole, as in La. *tectum* is sometimes used for *domus*, and *puppis* for *navis*; or, as in Eng. *sail* for *ship*. But, abstracting from all other considerations, the words of the original are unfavourable to that philosopher's interpretation; *ανεκλινεν αυτον εν τη φατνη* obviously implies, that this was the place wherein the child was laid, and whereby he was distinguished in point of place, not only from those without doors, but from those within. The Doctor has indeed attempted to give such a turn to the words, as may make *εν τη φατνη* relate in common to all the three preceding verbs, *ετεκεν*, *εσπαργανωσεν*, and *ανεκλινεν*; but with what success, must be submitted to the learned. To mention the laying of a child, without saying where, is a very blank sort of information; and when the place is named, we expect it to be what particularly marks the situation of the child, and not what he has in common with those who thus dispose of him, and perhaps with many others. If Mary had borne Jesus in her own house, would it have been natural to say, She brought forth her first-born son, and swathed him, and laid him, without adding a word, such as in a cradle, or on a couch, to denote where? But if, for explanation, it had been added simply *in the house*, or *there*, we should have surely thought the whole clause exceedingly superfluous; for who can suppose that she would have taken him to another house? It strengthens my argument, that the word *φατνη* occurs again twice in this chapter, and is always connected with the position of the child, *κειμενοι εν τη φατνη*. Nor can it be said with truth that *εν τη φατνη* may relate equally, as Dr. Priestley explains it, to all who had been named. If the word *κειμενον* had not been subjoined to *βρεφος*, I should admit the plausibility of this exposition; but the participle *κειμενον*, as has been observed, requires some such supplement, and consequently appropriates what follows as the full expression of the situation of the babe. But to return to bishop Pearce's exposition: on what authority a bag made of goat's hair is believed to have been called *φατνη*, he has not thought fit to inform us. The like contrivance amongst ourselves, though very common, we never call *a manger*. The very quotations produced by Dr. Pearce confute his hypothesis. Homer represents the horse as chained to the *φατνη*, and getting loose from it only by breaking his chain. Could he mean to say, that he had been secured by being bound to a haircloth bag, and not to something which he could not carry off? The quotation from

Virgil is precisely of the same kind, *abruptis fugit præsepia vinculis*. Those bags, Harmer tells us, are hung about the heads of the cattle; but surely they could never occasion the breaking of either chain or halter. It may be asked, What shall we say then to the authorities produced by Harmer, to wit, D'Arvieux, Thevenot, and Sir John Chardin, who affirm, that they use no mangers in the East, unless we bestow that name on the coarse bags above described? We will say that we admit the testimony of these, witnessess, as evidence not only of what they saw themselves, but of what was then customary in the countries which they visited. At the same time, we do not admit it as an evidence of what had been the practice there, seventeen hundred years before, especially when, as to the more ancient usages, we have direct testimony that they were different. There is here no opposition of testimony. We find, therefore, no difficulty in believing both. The one concerns the practice of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the other that of the first century alone. To obviate this, it has been affirmed, and is doubtless true, that the Asiatics are not so changeable as the Europeans, in what regards their manners and customs. But were we to conclude thence, that they never change at all, we should err more widely than if we should believe them as fickle as ourselves. The difference is only in degree. I have had occasion, in the Preliminary Dissertations, to indicate and to trace some of the changes which have obtained in opinions, in manners, and customs, and even in the import of words. Man is naturally mutable, and mutability, in some degree, cleaves to every thing that is human. It is indeed impossible that the revolutions (or changes affecting whole kingdoms and states) to which Syria and the neighbouring countries have been subjected, should not have produced great and numerous alterations in all the respects above mentioned. Their conquerors too, in different ages, have mostly been nations exceedingly different from one another, both in political principles and in religious ceremonies, the Chaldeans, the Persians, the Grecians, the Romans, the Arabians, and last of all the Turks. Are changes in government, such as these, compatible with a perfect uniformity in their fashions and customs? No certainly. Let it not, however, be imagined that I mean to depreciate such observations as those of Harmer. This is far from my intention. I know that, in many cases, they may be very

useful, and several of those made by that learned author, undoubtedly, are so ; but all observations of that kind are then most safely applied, when they throw light upon a passage of Scripture which, misled by our own customs, we find obscure ; and not when they serve to darken what is expressed both plainly and explicitly. If a present custom in the East, applied to any ancient fact recorded, makes a passage clear which is otherwise inexplicable, it is a very strong presumption, and in some cases even a proof, that their present is the continuation of their ancient practice. But let it not, on the other hand, be founded on as an axiom, that whatever is used at present in that part of the world was always so, or that whatever was once their fashion, is the fashion with them still ; than both which nothing can be more evidently false. As to the point in question, the word *φατνη* is used in the Sep. as the version of a Heb. word, which manifestly denotes the manger, crib, or vessel, in a stable, out of which the cattle eat. The Heb. *אבוס* *ebus*, which is so rendered, appears, both from etymology and from use, to be of this import. See Job. xxxix. 9. Is. i. 3. Prov. xiv. 4. The same may be said, with truth, of the Syriac word *אוריא* *auria*, by which it is translated in that ancient version ; and as to the Gr. term Phavorinus says, *φατνη παρα του φαγειν γινεται*. But though enough has been said to remove so slight a presumption founded on their present customs, I shall, on this article, give positive evidence, both that the practice was in Asia, in ancient times, to feed their cattle out of mangers, or vessels made of durable materials, as stone, wood, or metal, and that it was actually in such a vessel that our Lord was laid. First, that mangers were used Asia, particularly by the Persians, of whom Harmer tells us, from Thevenot, that at present they have in their stables no such implement ; the authority of Herodotus will put beyond dispute. In relating the final victory obtained by the Greeks over the Persians, and the total expulsion of the latter out of Greece, he acquaints us that the tent of Mardonius, the commander in chief of the Persian army, was pillaged, and that there was found in it a brazen manger for his horses, which, on account of its singular beauty, was presented to the goddess Alea Minerva, in whose temple it was deposited. His words are [l. ix.], *Την σκηνην του Μαρδονιου ουτοι [Τεγεηται] εβαν δι διαρπαδαντες, τα τε αλλα εξ αυτης και την φατνην των ιππων εουσαν χαλκεην πασαν και θεης αξιην την μεν νυν φατνην ταυτην την Μαρδονιου ανεθεσαν*

εσ τον νηον της Αλεξς Αθηναιης. Nobody will pretend that the historian could mean that Mardonius carried about with him a brass stable for his horses, which the Greeks found in his tent. Every circumstance of the story adds to the credibility of the fact, but more especially of that point with which alone my argument is concerned. We have here the testimony of an historian worthy of credit, particularly in matters which fell within his own knowledge, which when he wrote, were recent in respect of time, and in respect of place, transacted on the most public theatre, at that time, in the world; a testimony, besides, with the best means of confuting which, if it had been false, he furnished his cotemporaries, by telling them where this curious piece of furniture was to be seen. Now, let it be observed, that this story is still stronger evidence that the Persians were then accustomed to the use of mangers, than it is of the particular fact related. Had it answered any purpose to the historian to tell a falsehood, he would never have contrived a falsehood notoriously contradictory to the Persian customs, at that time well known in Greece. Neither could he himself be ignorant of their customs. Not to mention his extensive knowledge, he was an Asiatic, a native and citizen of Halicarnassus, a city of Caria in Asia Minor, and consequently in the neighbourhood of the Persian dominions. To this testimony I shall add that of Justin Martyr, the first of the Fathers after the disciples of the Apostles; he wrote about the middle of the second century. He says expressly, that when Joseph could find no place in the village of Bethlehem to lodge in, he betook himself to a cave near it, and that, when they were there, Mary bore the Messiah, and laid him in a manger. His words are [Dial. cum. Tryphone,] *Επειδαν Ιωδσηφ ουκ ειχεν εν τη κωμη εξεινη που καταλυσαι, εν σπηλαιω τιη συνεγγυς της κωμης κατελυσε, και τοτε αυτων οντων εκει. ετετοχει η Μαρια τον χριστον και εν φατνη αυτον ετεθεικει.* Now, nothing can be more evident, than that here the *σπηλαιον*, where Joseph and Mary were lodged, is distinguished from the *φατνη* where she laid the infant. Such natural caves as could in a strait afford shelter both to men and cattle, were not uncommon in that country; and a principle of humanity or of hospitality, for which the ancients were remarkable, might influence the people to bestow some labour upon them, in order to render them more commodious. This, at least, is not an implausible way of accounting for their finding a manger, and perhaps some other

conveniences, in such a place. But, whatever be in this, for I am no wise interested to promote the credit of the tradition, though very ancient ; and though Origen, who wrote in the third century, confirms it, telling us, that at Bethlehem they showed the cave wherein Jesus was born, and the manger in the cave wherein he was swathed (contra Celsum, *Δεικνυται το εν Βηθλεεμ σπηλαιον ενθα εγεννηθη, και η εν τω σπηλαιω φατνη εν η εσπαργανωφη ;*) from these testimonies it is very evident, that in those days such implements in a stable, as we call *mangers*, were well known, and in common use in Judea. For, let it be remembered, that Justin was a native of Palestine, having been born in Neapolis of Samaria, the city which, in Scripture, is called *Sechem* and *Sichar*. Origen also had lived some time in the country. In which way soever, therefore, we understand the story of the cave, related by Justin, as a fiction, or as a fact, it is a full proof that they were not then unacquainted with the use of *mangers*.

² *In the house allotted to strangers, εν τω καταλυματι.* E. T. *In the inn.* I shall, here, not only for the vindication of the version, but for the further illustration of the whole passage, make a few observations on the houses built in the East, for the reception of strangers. Busbequius, ambassador at the Porte, from the emperors Ferdinand and Maximilian, a man well acquainted with the Turkish polity and manners, both in Europe and in Asia, where, on the public service, he had also occasion to be, mentions (Epis.1.) three sorts of houses built for the accommodation of travellers. The first is the *caravansary*, the most considerable, and that which, from its external magnificence, is the most apt to attract the attention of strangers. *It is*, says Busbequius, *a very large building ;* commonly lighted from the top, either by sky-lights, or by a spacious dome, which serves for ornament, as well as use. Into this edifice, which is all under one roof, and has no partitions, all travellers, and their cattle, are admitted promiscuously. The only division in it, is an arena in the middle for the servants, the beasts, and the baggage, enclosed with a parapet, three feet high, which is so broad as to reach the wall of the house on every side, and thus to form a stone bench all along the walls, for accommodating the travellers, and raising them above the level of the horses, camels, and mules. This bench is commonly from four to six feet broad. There are chimneys, at proper distances, in the walls. Every little party has such a proportion

of this bench, with a chimney, as must serve for kitchen, parlour, and bed-chamber. They use the provisions which they bring with them, or which they purchase in the place. At night the saddle-cloth, and their own upper garments, commonly serve for bed-clothes, and the saddle for a pillow. The public supplies them only in lodging. The account given by this Imperial minister, in the sixteenth century, does not materially differ, in any thing, from what is related by Tournefort, and other travellers of the present age. Busbequius calls the second sort of public house *Xenodochium*, which, he says, is only to be found in a few places. The former is intended chiefly for the accommodation of those travelling companies, called *caravans*, from which it derives its name; the latter receives no cattle, nor are the strangers huddled together as in the *caravansary*, but are decently accommodated in separate apartments, and supplied at the public charge for three days, if they choose to stay so long, in moderate but wholesome food. The third he calls *stabulum*, and of this kind he mentions some as very capacious, though not so magnificent as the *caravansary*. Here also the travellers and their cattle were under the same roof, and not separated by any partition-wall from each other. Only the former possessed the one side, which had at least one chimney, and the latter the other. When he himself, in travelling, was forced to put up with such quarters (for this sometimes happened,) he tells us that he made the curtains of his tent serve for a partition between him and the other travellers. Now, of the three sorts, it is probable that these two only, the *xenodochium* and the *stabulum*, were known in the days of the Apostles. Indeed the first mentioned, the *caravansary*, appears no other than an improvement of the *stabulum*, the plan being much enlarged, and perhaps a few accommodations added; of all which it is likely that the annual pilgrimages to Mecca, after the establishment of Mahometism in the East, first suggested the necessity. Of the two other kinds there appear such traces in Scripture as render it at least credible that they were both in common use. The *καταλυμα* mentioned twice by this Evangelist, once by Mr. and occurring sometimes in the Sep. answers to the *xenodochium* of Busbequius; the *παιδοχειον* of L. in conformity to its name, corresponds to the *stabulum*, of the other. It is accordingly so rendered in the Vul. whereas *diversorium* is that by which *καταλυμα* is rendered in that translation.

All the later translators into La. Er. Ar. Zu. Cas. and Be. less properly confound these words, rendering both *diversorium*. In cases of this kind, immediately depending on the customs of a country, the old translator who, from his vicinity in time and place, had the best opportunity of knowing the customs, is entitled to the preference. It deserves our notice also, that the ancient Sy. never confounds the two words. In this, therefore, I agree with Bishop Pearce, that *πανδοχειον* and *καταλυμα* are not synonymous. As the same distinction, however, does not obtain with us which obtained with them, we have not names exactly corresponding; but there is resemblance enough in the chief particulars to make the term *inn*, a tolerable version of the word *πανδοχειον* but not of *καταλυμα*; for that cannot be called an *inn* where the lodges are at no charges, which was most probably the case of the *καταλυμα*. It was necessary that there should be at Jerusalem, whither the three great festivals brought regularly, thrice in the year, an immense concourse of people, very many of the former kind, the *καταλυματα*. There was but one *καταλυμα*, it seems, at Bethlehem, a small village, and, when Joseph came thither, it was full. For this reason, the pious pair, if they did not betake themselves to the cave, according to the tradition above mentioned, must have had recourse to the homely harbourage of a *πανδοχειον*, or *stabulum*: This, in my opinion, removes every difficulty, and is perfectly consistent with every circumstance related by the Evangelist. The place was not properly a *stable*, in our sense of the word, a house only for cattle, but was intended for supplying travellers, as to this day they are supplied in the East, with both stable and lodging under the same roof. Nor did it belong to what is called the *καταλυμα*, the house allotted for the reception of strangers, with which it had no connexion. They were different kinds of what, in old language, were called *hostelries*, and quite independent on each other. By this explanation, without needing to recur to a cave without the town (an hypothesis liable to some obvious objections,) we can admit Wet.'s reasoning in all its force. "If," says he, "the manger was a part of the stable, and the stable a part of the inn, he who had room in the stable had room in the inn. When Luke, therefore, says, that there was no room for them in the inn, he shows that the stable was unconnected

with the inn." The pains that has been taken by some learned men to furnish our Lord and his parents on this occasion with better quarters, I cannot help thinking, savours somewhat of that ancient prejudice called *the scandal of the cross*, which has clung to our religion from the beginning, and which, in the first ages, produced all the extravagances of the Docetæ, and many others. This prejudice, wherever it prevails, displays a wonderful dexterity in removing, or at least weakening, those circumstances in the history of our Lord, which are, in the world's account, humiliating. It is an amazing conceit, in a man of Wet.'s abilities, to fancy that there was more dignity in our Lord's being born in a cave than in a stable; because, forsooth, the fables of idolaters, represent Rhea as having brought forth Jupiter in a cave. "A cave," says he, "has something in it venerable and divine, whereas nothing is more despicable and rustic than a stable." *Antrum nobis aliquid venerandum et divinum: stabulum vero humile et rusticum representat.* To remarks of this kind, so unsuitable to the spirit of our religion, it is sufficient to answer in the words of our Lord [L. xvi. 15.], *Το εν ανθρωποις υψηλον, βδελυγμα ενωπιον του Θεου εστιν.*

9. *A divine glory, δοξα Κυριου.* E. T. *The glory of the Lord.* It was a known figure among the Hebrews, to raise, by the name of God, the import of any thing mentioned, to the highest degree possible. See the note on verse 40th.

14. *In the highest heaven, εν υψιστοις.* E. T. *In the highest.* It is not agreeable to the Eng. idiom to use an adjective so indefinitely as the word *highest*, without a substantive, would, in this place, be. When it is employed as a name of God, the context never fails to show the meaning, and thereby remove all appearance of impropriety. As the Jews reckoned three heavens, *the highest* was considered as the place of the throne of God. When we find it contrasted with earth, as in this verse, we have reason to assign it this meaning: the one is mentioned as the habitation of God, the other as that of men. This is entirely in the Jewish manner. *God is in heaven and thou upon the earth* (Eccl. v. 2.) *Thy will be done upon the earth, as it is in heaven* (Mt. vi. 10). The plural number is used in the original, because the Heb. word for *heaven* is never in the singular. The only place in the O. T. where the phrase

εν υμειςτοις is employed by the 70, is Job xvi. 19. in which it is evidently used in the same sense as by the Evangelist here.

* *Peace upon the earth, and good will towards men, επι γης ειρηνη, εν ανθρωποις ευδοκια.* Vul. *In terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.* The La. version is evidently founded on a different reading of the original. Accordingly, in the Al. and Cam. MSS. but in no other, we find *ευδοκίας* in the genitive. The Go. and the Sax. are the only translations which, with the Vul. favour this reading. Since the passage, as commonly read, admits a meaning, at least as clear and apposite as that which we find in the Vul. and as the authorities which support the former are incomparably superior, both in number and in value, to those which favour the latter, it is plain that no change ought to be made. I do not think it an objection of any weight against the common reading, that the copulative is wanting before the last member. It would have some weight in simple narrative, but in a doxology, such as this, has none at all. The Sy. indeed, has the conjunction prefixed to this clause as well as to the preceding; but as there is not for this the authority of any Gr. MS. it has probably been inserted by the translator, merely to render the expression more complete. In the way the passage is rendered in the Vul. it is difficult to say, with any degree of confidence, what is the meaning. The most likely, when we consider the ordinary import of the words in Scripture, is that which may be expressed in this manner, *peace upon the earth to the men whom God favoureth.* This sense, however, it must be owned, does but ill suit the context, in which the angels are represented as saying, that the good news which they bring shall prove matter of great joy to all the people. It ought surely, in that case, to have been said only to some of the people, namely, to those whom God favour-eth. That none can enjoy true peace whom God does not favour, is manifest; but then, by the first expression, we are taught, that God, in sending the Messiah, favours all the people; by the second, that he favours only a part. Though these different sentiments may, perhaps, on different views of the subject, both be justified; yet, as there is nothing here to suggest a different view, the most consistent interpretation is the most probable. *The peace of good will,* which bishop Pearce has proposed in interpreting the words, is an unscriptural, and I even think, unnatural, expression.

19. *Weighing*, *συμβαλλουσα*. Vul. Fr. Zu. Be. *Conferens*. Cas. to the same purpose, *Perpendens*. Elsner has produced a number of examples from Pagan authors, to prove that the word *συμβαλλουσα* may be here most fitly rendered into La. *Mentem eorum probe assecuta*, having attained the understanding of them. He is in this followed by Palairet: only the latter prefers rendering the word more simply, *intelligens*, understanding them. Raphelius has shown that, if we were to inspect the places whence Elsner's examples were taken, we should find, both from the sentence itself, and from the context, that the verb is at least as susceptible of one or other of these significations, *to weigh, to compare, to conjecture*, as of that which he gives it. I confess, that to me it appears much more susceptible of this sense than of the other. Wet. seems to have been of the same opinion. After producing many similar quotations, from Grecian authors, which manifestly yield a good and apposite meaning so interpreted, he concludes with observing, "De conjectoribus et interpretibus sominorum oraculorumque dicitur." Here I cannot avoid making a few observations on the manner in which authorities are sometimes alleged by critics. They seem to think that, if the words of a quotation, taken by themselves, make sense, when interpreted in the way they propose, it is sufficient evidence that they have given the meaning of the author in that place. Now this is, in reality, no evidence at all. That such an interpretation yields *a sense*, is one thing, that it yields *the sense* of the author, is another. Of two different meanings, the chief consideration, which can reasonably ascertain the preference, is, when one clearly suits the scope of the author, and the connexion of the paragraph, and the other does not. Yet, if the sentence may be considered independently, it may make sense either way explained. That this is the case with Elsner's examples, wherein the verb *συμβαλλειν* is equally capable of being translated *to guess*, as *to understand*, I should think it losing time to illustrate. The judicious critic, when he considers the connexion, will find them, if I mistake not, more capable of being rendered in the former way than in the latter. They all relate to dreams and oracles, concerning which the heathens themselves admitted that there could be no certain knowledge. I observe 2dly, That in criticising the inspired writers, whose manner is, in many respects, peculiar, I should think it exceedingly obvious, that the first

first recourse for authorities ought to be to the writer himself, or to the other sacred penmen who employ the word in question [Diss. IV. §4—8.] The only writer in the N. T. who uses the verb *συβαλλω* is L. In five places, beside this, he has employed it ; but in none of the five, will it admit the sense which Elsner assigns it here. The same thing may be affirmed, with truth, concerning those passages wherein it occurs in the Sep. and the Apocrypha. Need I add, that the Sy. version, which renders the word in this place *ܟܡܗܘܡ* perfectly agrees with the Vul. ? Indeed, as far as the sense is concerned, I do not recollect to have observed any difference among translators ; and that even Mary did not understand every thing relating to her son, we learn from the 50th verse of this chapter. I shall only further observe in passing (but I do not lay any stress on this as an argument,) that it is not in the manner of the sacred writers to celebrate the abilities of the saints, but their virtues. Whenever they commend, they hold forth truth an object of imitation to their readers. The understanding of this excellent personage was merely an ability or talent : but her weighing every thing that related to this most important subject, and carefully treasuring it up in her memory, was an evidence of her piety, and of the ardent desire she had to learn the things of God. This is a thing imitable by others ; but neither natural acuteness of understanding, nor supernatural gifts, can properly be objects of imitation to us.

22. *Their purification, καθαρισμὸν αὐτῶν.* E. T. *Her purification.* Vul. *Purgationis ejus.* In a very few Gr. copies, there is a diversity of reading. The Cam. and three others of less note, for *αὐτῶν* read *αὐτοῦ*, thus making it *his purification*. The Com. which had in this been followed by Be. and the two printers, Plantin and Elzevir, read *αὐτῆς*, *her*. The Cop. and Ara. versions omit the pronoun altogether. Wet. has classed the Vul. as supporting the few Gr. MSS. which read *αὐτοῦ*, *his*, and I cannot help thinking him in the right. *Ejus* is of itself equivocal, meaning either *his* or *her*. Which of the two is meant, in a particular case, must always be learned from the connexion of the words. Now the pronoun is so connected here as, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, not to admit another meaning than *his*. Mary is not mentioned in the foregoing verse, nor even in that which preceded it. The last time she is mentioned is in v. 19. relating to a quite different matter. Jesus

is mentioned in the words immediately preceding ; and the same personal pronoun occurs in the two verses, both before and after, referring to him. But the verses themselves in the Vul. will make this evident without a comment. *Et postquam consummati sunt dies octo, ut circumcideretur puer, vocatum est nomen ejus Jesus, quod vocatum est ab angelo, priusquam in utero conciperetur. Et postquam impleti sunt dies purgationis ejus secundum legem Moysi, tulerunt illum in Jerusalem, ut sistereut cum Domino.* Be this, however, as it will, all the translations from the Vul. which I have seen, consider *ejus*, as in this place, feminine. Were the question, what, in our judgment, the expression should be, and not what it actually is (questions often confounded by the critics,) I should, for obvious reasons, strongly incline, as others have done, to read *αυτης*, *her*, in preference to all other readings. But I must acknowledge that upon examination, it appears to be that reading, which, of all those above mentioned, has the least support from positive evidence. I should rather say, it has none at all. Not a single MS. is there, not one ancient writer, or old translation, if we except the Vul. ; and how equivocal its testimony in this place is, has been shown already. For my part, I rather consider it, with Wet. as one witness for the reading in the Cam. All the evidence then is reduced to cardinal Ximenes, who will not be thought of great weight with those who consider the freedoms which he sometimes took, in order to produce in his Gr. edition a closer conformity to the Vul. Be. does not pretend the authority of MSS. for his following, in this passage, the Com. His only reason is the incongruity which he found in the ordinary reading, *αυτων*. Nor is it of any weight that some printers followed, in this, his edition. Let us then consider briefly, but impartially, those apparent incongruities in the common reading, which make people so unwilling to receive it. One is, it is not conformable to the style of the law of Moses on this subject. The purification after child-birth is never called the purification of the child, but of the mother. Though this is certainly true, it may be justly affirmed that it is conformable to the spirit of the law to consider what may be called the legal state of the mother, and of the child suckled by her, as the same. Now, though the uncleanness of the mother, after bearing a male child, lasted only seven days, she remained thirty-three days longer debarred from touching any hallowed thing,

or going into the sanctuary. Nor could the first-born male be legally presented to the Lord, and redeemed, till he was a month old at least. But as the time was not, like that of circumcision, fixed to a particular day, it is not unlikely that it may have been customary, because convenient, for those who lived at a distance from Jerusalem, to allot the same time for the purification and the redemption (as was actually done in this case,) and to consider the ceremonies in a complex view, as regarding both mother and child. The only other objection which operates powerfully against the reception of the common reading, is, that it appears to attribute impurity of some kind or other to our Lord Jesus, from which he needed to be cleansed. But nothing is more certain than what is observed by Gro. that this, notwithstanding its name, implied no more than certain restraints upon the person, till after the performance of certain rites. We are apt to connect with the notion of impurity, or the uncleanness described in the ceremonial law, some degree of guilt or moral pravity. But this is entirely without foundation. There was an uncleanness contracted by the touch of a dead body; but this being often unavoidable, and sometimes accidental, it was not in any sense a transgression, unless in a few particular cases. It would have been indeed a transgression, if voluntary, in the high priest, because to him expressly prohibited. His sacred functions required that the necessary care about the interment of persons deceased, though nearly connected with him, should be committed to other hands. The ordinary priests, however, were allowed to defile themselves for near relations. And, as they were permitted, their defilement, in such cases, was no transgression, and consequently implied no sin. Nay more, in many cases, it was a man's duty to defile himself, in the sense of the ceremonial law. Nobody will deny, that it was necessary, and therefore a duty, to take care of the dying, and to bury the dead. Yet this duty could not be performed without occasioning uncleanness. Nay, the ceremonial law itself required the doing of that which produced this defilement. The priest and others, employed in sacrificing and burning the red heifer, and gathering her ashes, were all rendered unclean by what they did, yet they were obliged by law to do it. Num. xix. 7, 8, 10. It was, therefore, in some cases, a man's duty to make himself unclean. If, indeed, a person in this state had entered the congregation of the Lord, or touched any thing intentionally, and without necessity, not permitted to such, or had neglected

to use, in due time, the rites of cleansing, he would, by this presumption, have rendered himself a transgressor, but not by what is called defiling himself, which the ceremonial law allowed in many cases, and which, in some cases, the moral law, or law of nature, nay, even the ceremonial law, required.

23. *Every male who is the first-born of his mother, παν αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν.* Dod. *Every first-born male.* I should, probably, have adopted this expression of Dod. as briefer, if there did not appear an ambiguity in it, which is not in the other. A son may, not improperly, be called the first-born male, who is born before all the other male children of the family, notwithstanding that there may have been one or more females born before him. And if I mistake not, we frequently use the phrase in this meaning. But such a child is not *αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν*, and, consequently, not a male who is the *first-born* in the sense of this law, which takes place only when the first child which a woman bears, is a male. There is the greater reason for remarking the difference, because the Jews, themselves, made a distinction between the first-born, when it denotes the heir or person entitled to a double portion of his father's estate, and to some other privileges; and the first-born, when it denotes a person who is consecrated to God by his birth, and must in due time be redeemed. Such were, upon the old constitution, before God selected for himself the tribe of Levi in their stead, destined for the priesthood. Now, this sacred prerogative did not always coincide with the civil rights of primogeniture. Unless the child was at once the first-born of his mother, and the eldest son of his father in lawful wedlock, he was not entitled to the civil rights of the first-born, or a double portion of the inheritance. He might, nevertheless, be a first-born son in the religious sense, and subjected to this law of consecration and redemption. The Patriarch Jacob had, by different wives, two sons, Reuben and Joseph, each of whom came under the description here given of *αρσεν διανοιγον μητραν*, and so was consecrated by his birth. But Reuben alone was entitled to the patrimony of the first-born (if he had not forfeited it by his criminal behaviour,) as being the first-fruits of both parents. (See Gen. xlix. 3, 4. 1 Chron. v. 1, 2.) It is worthy of remark that, on Reuben's forfeiture, even the civil prerogative, the double portion, did not descend, according to our notions of seniority, to the son

next in age to Reuben ; *for*, says the sacred historian, *he* [Reuben] *was the first-born ; but forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birth-right was given unto the sons of Joseph.* This does not appear to have happened in consequence of a particular destination in Joseph's favour, else it is probable that, in the history, notice would have been taken of that circumstance, but, on the failure of Reuben, to have fallen to Joseph in course. Now, according to the European rules of succession, all the other sons of Jacob by Leah, to wit, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun, as being elder than Joseph, had a preferable title. But eldership is one thing, and primogeniture another. When there was no claim to primogeniture in a family ; as, when the first-born was a female, or had died ; the double portion came, of course, to the senior brother ; but the sacred character could not be transferred. In regard to Dan the first-born of Bilhah, and Gad the first-born of Zilpah, not only had they no title to the civil rights of primogeniture, but it is even doubtful, by reason of the servile condition of the mothers, whether they could be accounted *holy* by their birth. It is universally admitted that Isaac, though the younger son, being the child of a free-woman, while Ishmael, the elder son, was the child of a slave, was alone entitled to all the prerogatives of primogeniture, both sacred and civil. A Gentile mother is also, by the Rabbies, deemed incapable of conveying the rights of the first-born of either kind to her offspring. Any glaring deformity, a defect or redundancy in any of the members, effectually divested the first-born of his sacred character, but not of his patrimonial birth-right. A number of cases have been put by the Rabbies, which are more curious than important, in order to show when the two species of right coincided in the same individual, and when they did not. But they are not, in every thing, unanimous on this subject ; and their decisions, though specious, are not always satisfactory. See Selden, lib. De successionibus, &c. ad leges Ebræorum, cap. vii.

² *Is consecrated to the Lord, ἅγιον τῷ Κυρίῳ κληθίσεται.* E. T. *Shall be called holy to the Lord.* P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. *sera consacré au Seigneur.* An. *Shall be consecrated to the Lord.* It has been frequently observed, and justly, that *to be called*, and *to be*, often mean the same thing in the Hebrew idiom. The word *called* has, with them, in such cases, nearly the import of the Eng.

words *held, acknowledged, accounted*. Now, that a thing is acknowledged to be of a particular kind, is considered as a consequence of its being of that kind, previously to the acknowledgment. It follows, that if, in translating such sentences, the verb *καλεω* be entirely dropt, and the epithet *holy* be supplied by the participle perfect of an active verb, the future tense cannot be retained, without turning a simple declaration of what is, into a command of something to be done. *To consecrate*, doubtless, gives a more perspicuous sense, in Eng. than *to call holy*. Yet, *shall be consecrated* would, in this place, imply more than is implied in the original. It would imply an order for the performance of some solemn ceremony of consecration, such, for example, as was used when God commanded Moses to consecrate Aaron and his sons. This future, thus employed, has in our language, the effect of the imperative: whereas, in the present instance, it is manifestly the intention of the writer to inform us, that this single circumstance, in the birth of a male, that he is the first-born of his mother, does, of itself, consecrate him. In such cases, therefore, the words are more accurately, as well as perspicuously, rendered, *is consecrated*, than *shall be consecrated to the Lord*. In the former way the words appear, as they ought, not a precept, but an affirmation. If, instead of a participle, an adjective be employed, the future may, without impropriety, be retained. The versions of Hey. and Wes. are both good. The first says, *shall be held sacred to the Lord*; the second, *shall be holy to the Lord*. In neither of these is there any appearance of a command of what is to be done; each is a distinct declaration of what obtains in every such instance.

24. *A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons*. This was the offering required from the poor. Those in better circumstances were commanded to bring a lamb of the first year, for a burnt-offering, and a turtle-dove, or a young pigeon, for a sin-offering.

30, 31. *The Saviour whom thou hast provided, το σωτηριον σου ητοιμασας*. E. T. *Thy salvation which thou hast prepared*. In every language, we sometimes meet with such tropes as the abstract for the concrete, the cause for the effect, and the like. In the Oriental tongues, however, they seem to be more common than in most others. Thus, God is called our defence, our song, our hope; that is, our defender, the subject of our song, the object of our hope.

But when, in any occurrence, the words literally translated appear but ill adapted to the idiom of our tongue, or occasion obscurity, it is better to express the sense in plain words.

33. *Joseph, Ιωσήφ.* Vul. *pater ejus.* The Cam. with three other MSS. *ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ.* With this agree the Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions.

38. *To all those in Jerusalem, who expected deliverance, πασι τοις προσδεχομενοις λυτρωσιν εν Ἱερουσαλημ.* E. T. *To all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.* Vul. *Omnibus qui expectabant redemptionem Israel.* This version is evidently founded on a different reading. It is favoured by the Vat. which is singular, in having *του Ἰσραηλ* for *εν Ἱερουσαλημ.* Three MSS. of small account, read *εν τῷ Ἰσραηλ.* The Al. and two others of less note, read *Ἱερουσαλημ,* without the preposition, and thus make the meaning, *the deliverance of Jerusalem.* This reading is followed by the Sy. Go. Sax. and Cop. versions. As these differences make no material alteration on the sense, and as the common reading is incomparably better supported than any other, and entirely suited to the scope of the passage, it is, in every respect, entitled to the preference. The expectation of the Messiah, though very general, was not universal.

40. *Adorned with a divine gracefulness, χαρις Θεου ην επ αυτω.* E. T. *The grace of God was upon him.* A verbal translation sometimes expresses the sense with sufficient clearness; and sometimes, though obscure or equivocal, it is not more so than the original. In either case, it admits a plausible apology: but here, I imagine, the words of the Evangelist will, to a discerning reader, suggest a meaning which can hardly be said to be conveyed to any, by what is called the literal version. The word *χαρις* has, in Scripture, several significations, to which there is not one Eng. word that will, in all cases, answer. Our translators have been as attentive to uniformity as most others; yet, for this word, which is oftenest rendered *grace*, they have, on different occasions, employed one or other of the following, *favour, liberality, benefit, gift, sake, cause, pleasure, thank, thankworthy, acceptable*; and even these are not all. Let it not be concluded hence, that the Gr. word must be very equivocal and indefinite. Notwithstanding the aforesaid remark, it

is very rarely so. But it is commonly the words in immediate connexion, which, in all languages, limit the acceptation of one another, and put the meaning beyond a doubt. The word *grace*, in Eng. admits a considerable latitude of signification, as well as the Gr. *χαρις*, yet is seldom so situated as to appear, to the intelligent, liable to be misunderstood. A reader of discernment will be sensible, that use in the language as truly fixes these limits, as it does the common acceptation of words, or the rules of inflection and construction. I have preferred *gracefulness*, in the version of this passage, as more explicit; though it cannot be denied that the word *grace* often bears the same meaning. Nay, I must add that, in this sense, it corresponds to the most common meaning of the Gr. term in classical writers. But this is a sense which, though not so common, is not without precedent in the sacred penmen, and particularly in this Evangelist. In ch. iv. 22. of this Gospel, the term is manifestly used in the same meaning: *Εθαυμαζον επι τοις λογοις της χαριτος τοις εκπορευομενοις εκ του στοματος αυτου*: here rendered, *Were astonished at the words, full of grace, which he uttered*. The charms of his elocution, which had an irresistible effect on the hearers, are evidently here pointed out. *Gracious words*, in the common translation, are not at all suited to the scope of the passage. See the note on that place. The word appears to me to be used in the same sense, Acts iv. 33. where the historian, speaking of the testimony which the Apostles gave in behalf of their master, when they entered on their ministry, says, *Χαρις τε μεγαλη ην επι παντας αυτους*; to denote the divine eloquence wherewith they expressed themselves, agreeably to the promise of their Lord, that they should receive a mouth and wisdom, which all their adversaries should not be able to withstand. In like manner, I take this to be the import of the word, Acts vii. 10. where Stephen says of the Patriarch Joseph, *Ο Θεος εδωκεν αυτω χαριν και σοφιαν εναντιον Φαραω*. I acknowledge that our translators have, not implausibly, rendered the words, *God gave him favour and wisdom in the sight of Pharaoh*. It is, however, more probable, and more agreeable to the rules of interpretation, that the gifts, *χαριν και σοφιαν*, thus coupled, should be understood as denoting distinct personal talents bestowed on Joseph, and not that only one of them, *σοφιαν*, should express a personal quality, and that *χαριν* should denote, barely, the effect of the other, or that affection which the discovery of his wisdom would procure him. The

sense, therefore, in my opinion, is, that God united in Joseph, that discernment, which qualified him for giving the best counsel, with those graces of elocution, which conciliated favour, and produced persuasion. *Χαρις* is also used in this manner by the Apostle Paul, Eph. iv. 29. Col. iv. 6. The addition of *Θεου* to *χαρις*, makes, in the Hebrew idiom, a kind of superlative, raising the signification as much as possible. For *χαρις* is not, like *πιστις*, expressive merely of a mental quality, but refers to effects both outward and sensible. (See Mr. xi. 22. N.) Thus, *αστειος τω Θεω*, applied to Moses, Acts vii. 20. when an infant, signifies *extremely beautiful*. As such expressions denote the highest degree of a valuable quality, they have, doubtless, arisen from the conviction, that God is to be regarded as the source whence every good and perfect gift descends. Wet. gives, in effect, the same explanation of this passage. For further confirming the version here given, it may be also observed, that when the Evangelists say any thing in relation to the characters of the persons of whom they write (which is but seldom,) their words, rightly explained, will always be found to convey a precise and distinct sentiment, and not to prove expressions merely indefinite, of what is good or bad in general. Now, the common version of this passage is exactly such a vague expression. For, to say that *χαρις* here means favour, is to say that the historian tells us nothing which we are not told verse 52. where it is said *he advanced in favour with God and man*. Now, I do not find that these writers are chargeable with such repetitions, so quickly recurring. Besides, in this acceptation, the phrase would not be, *χαρις ην επ' αυτω*; but *εβρε χαριν ενωπιον του Θεου*, or *παρα τω Θεω και προς τον λαον*. The thing to which, in my judgment, the historian here particularly points, is that graceful dignity in our Lord's manner which at once engaged the love, and commanded the respect, of all who heard him. To this we find several allusions made in these writings. See Mt. vii. 28, 29. Mr. i. 22. L. iv. 22. 32. J. vii. 46. All these passages, put together, indicate an authority, in his manner, superior to human, blended with the most condescending sweetness. With this distinguishing quality the Evangelist here acquaints us that Jesus was attended from his childhood.

44. *In the company*, *εν τη συνωδια*. *Συνωδια* means, properly, a company of travellers. As at the three great festivals, all the

men who were able, were obliged, and many women chose, at least at the passover, to attend the celebration at Jerusalem, they were wont, for their greater security against the attacks of robbers on the road, to travel in large companies. All who came, not only from the same city, but from the same canton or district, made one company. They carried necessaries along with them, and tents for their lodging at night. Sometimes, in hot weather, they travelled all night, and rested in the day. This is nearly the manner of travelling, in the East, to this hour. Such companies they now call *caravans*, and, in several places, have got houses fitted up for their reception, called *caravansaries*. See N. on v. 7. ². This account of their manner of travelling, furnishes a ready answer to the question, How could Joseph and Mary make a day's journey, without discovering before night, that Jesus was not in the company? In the day time, we may reasonably presume, that the travellers would, as occasion, business, or inclination, led them, mingle with different parties of their friends and acquaintance; but that, in the evening, when they were about to encamp, every one would join the family to which he belonged. As Jesus did not appear, when it was growing late, his parents first sought him where they supposed he would most probably be, amongst his relations and acquaintance, and not finding him, returned to Jerusalem.

48. *But they who saw him, were amazed, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν.* E. T. *And when they saw him, they were amazed;* that is, when Joseph and Mary (mentioned ver. 43.) saw him. This is the common way of rendering the words, and they are doubtless susceptible of this interpretation; but they are also susceptible of that here given. This is taken notice of by Bowyer, as an exposition suggested by Markland. Indeed, if the article had been prefixed to *ιδοντες*, I should not have thought the words capable of any other meaning. As they stand, the omission, especially after *πας* or *παντες*, and a participle in the nominative, with the article, is not unprecedented. Thus, Mt. xi. 28. *Λευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι, κ'γω αναπαυσω υμας.* It may, indeed, be objected that, in this example, both the participles are to be understood as relating to the same persons; in which case, the repetition of the article would hardly be proper. This, I acknowledge, may be the case, but the suppression of the article will not be admitted as

sufficient evidence that it is. For, in L. xiv. 11. where we read, *πας ὁ ὑψων ἑαυτον ταπεινοθησεται, και ταπεινων ἑαυτον ὑψωθησεται*, the two participles, so far from being applicable to the same individual, are contrasted, as representing persons of opposite characters. Yet the article, as well as the adjective *πας*, are omitted before the second participle: but every body must be sensible that they are understood as equally belonging to both. The case of the passage under review is similar. *Ἐξίσταντο δε παντες οἱ ακουοντες αυτου, επι τη συνησει και ταις αποκρισειν αυτου, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν*. Here the *παντες οἱ* may be understood as repeated before the second participle. An inconsiderable alteration in the arrangement of the words will make this criticism more sensibly felt. *Παντες δε οἱ ακουοντες αυτου εξίσταντο, και ιδοντες αυτον εξεπλαγησαν, επι τη συνησει και ταις αποκρισειν αυτου*. For the sake of perspicuity, I have followed this order in the version. But as the words are capable of the other interpretation above mentioned, my reasons for preferring that here given are these: 1st, In the ordinary explanation, the distance is rather too great between the participle in v. 48. and the nouns to which it refers in v. 43. This has made Be. think it necessary to supply the words *parentes ejus*, for removing the obscurity; and in this he has been followed by several other interpreters. 2dly, The meaning, here given, appears to me better suited to the scope of the passage. His parents may be said to have had reason of surprise, or even amazement, when they discovered that he was not in their company; but surely, to them at least, there was nothing peculiarly surprising, in finding that he was not amusing himself with boys, but in the temple, among the doctors, discoursing on the most important subjects. I may say justly that, to them, who knew whence he was, there was less ground of amazement at the wisdom and understanding displayed in his answers, than to any other human being. 3dly, It appears the intention of the Evangelist, in this passage, to impress us with a sense of the extraordinary attainment of our Lord, in wisdom and knowledge, even in childhood, from the effect which the discovery of them produced on others. All in the temple who, though they did not see him, were within hearing, and could judge from what they heard, were astonished at the propriety, the penetration, and the energy, they discovered in every thing he said; but those whose eye-

sight convinced them of his tender age, were confounded, as persons who were witnesses of something preternatural.

49. *At my Father's*, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου. E. T. *About my Father's business*. Sy. אֲבִי אֲבִי in domo patris mei. The Arm. version renders the words in the same manner. It has been justly observed, that τα τοῦ δεινός is a Gr. idiom, not only with classical writers, but with the sacred penmen, for denoting the house of such a person. Thus, Esther vii. 9. what is in Heb. בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ and in the E. T. *In the house of Haman*, is rendered by the Seventy, ἐν τοῖς Ἀμαν. Εἰς τα ἰδια, J. xix. 27. is justly translated, in the common version (and, I may add, to the same purpose, in every version I know,) *Unto his own home*. The idiom and ellipsis are the same. The like examples occur, Esth. v. 10. vi. 12. One who desires to see more, may consult Wet. upon the place. This interpretation has been given by many great scriptural critics, ancient and modern, Origen, Euth. The. Gro. Ham. Wet. and others. As the phrase is elliptical in Gr. I have, with Dod. expressed it elliptically in Eng. It is not often that our language admits so close a resemblance. 2, 13, 57.

CHAPTER III.

1. *Now, δε*. The Marcionites, who rejected the two preceding chapters, began their gospel here. It was urged by their adversaries, that the very conjunction δε, with which this chapter is introduced, which is translated in all the ancient versions, which was retained, it seems, by themselves, and is wanting only in two MSS. is itself an evidence of the mutilation of their copies, being always understood to imply that something preceded.

² *Procurator*. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 17.

2. *In the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas*, ἐπ' ἀρχιερωσῶν Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα. By the original constitution, one only could be high priest at one time, and the office was for life. But after the nation had fallen under the power of foreigners, great liberties were taken with this sacred office; and high priests, though still of the pontifical family of Aaron, were put in or out arbitrarily, as suited the humour, the interest, or the political views of their rulers. And though it does not appear that they ever appointed two to officiate

jointly in that station, there is some probability that the Romans, about this time, made the office annual, and that Annas or Ananus, as he is called by the Jewish historian, and Caiaphas enjoyed it by turns. See J. xi. 49. xviii. 3. Acts iv. 6. If this was the case, which is not unlikely; or if, as some think, the *sagan*, or deputy, is comprehended under the same title, we cannot be justly surprised that they should be named as colleagues by the Evangelist. In any event it may have been usual, through courtesy, to continue to give the title to those who had ever enjoyed that dignity, which, when they had no king, was the greatest in the nation. It is not improper to add, that a very great number of MSS. many of them of the highest value, read *αρχιερεως*, in the singular. Though this reading does not well suit the syntactic order, and though it is not favoured by any ancient version, except the Cop. it is approved by Wet.

13. *Exact no more, μηδεν πλεον πρασσετε.* Vul. *Nihil amplius faciatis.* Er. *Ne quid amplius exigatis.* In this Er. who has been followed by Leo, Cas. Be. the Eng. and other modern translators, has, without departing from the known meaning of the Gr. verb, given a version that is both apposite and perspicuous. We cannot say so much of the passage, as translated in the Vul.

18. *And with many other exhortations, he published the good tidings to the people.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 4.

19. *His brother's wife, της γυναικος Φιλιππου του αδελφου αυτου.* The word *Φιλιππου* is wanting in very many MSS. both of great and of little account. It is not in some of the oldest and best editions, nor in the Vul. Arm. Go. and Sax. versions. It is, besides, rejected by Mill and Wet. The latter observes, that the name is rightly omitted here, as otherwise the person meant might readily be mistaken for the Philip mentioned v. 1. This consideration adds to the probability that he has not been named in this place, because, if the Evangelist had named him, it is natural to think, that he would have added some circumstance to discriminate him from the Philip he had mentioned so short while before.

23. *Now Jesus was himself about thirty years in subjection, και αυτου ην ο Ιησους ωσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος.* E. T. *And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age.* Nothing, 1

think, is plainer than that, by no rule of syntax, can the Gr. words be so construed, as to yield the sense which our translators have given them. Admitting that *ην αρχομενος* may be used for *ηρχετο*; because, though the phrase does not occur in Scripture, it is not un-conformable to the Gr. idiom; yet if *αρχομενος* mean, here, *beginning*, something still is wanting to complete the sense. Some, therefore, to fill up the deficiency, join the word *ων*, immediately following, to this clause, and, by an extraordinary *enallage*, cause the participle to supply the place of the infinitive. Thus, they make the Evangelist say, *ην αρχομενος ων*, for *ηρχετο ειναι*. As if we should say in Eng. *And he was beginning being*, instead of, *And he began to be*, for the expression in the one language, is no way preferable to that in the other. Those who imagine that, in so plain a case, the Evangelist would have expressed himself in so obscure, so perplexed, and so unnatural, a manner, have a notion very different from mine, of the simplicity of style employed by these writers. Besides, some critics have justly remarked, that there is an incongruity in saying, in any language, *A man began to be about such an age*. When we say, a man is about such an age, we are always understood to denote, that we cannot say whether he be exactly so, or a little more, or a little less; but this will never suit the expression, *began to be*, which admits no such latitude. To combine, in this manner, a definite with an indefinite term, confounds the meaning, and leaves the reader entirely at a loss. Some interpret the words, *When he was about thirty years old, he began his ministry*. But as there is no mention of ministry, or allusion to it, either in what goes before, or in what follows, I suspect this mode of expression would be equally unprecedented with the former. The whole difficulty is removed at once, by making the import of the participle the same with that of *υπντασσομενος*, ch. ii. 51. *ruled, governed, in subjection*. Hey. has adopted this method, which was, he says, suggested by a remark he found in the book called *A Critical Examination of the holy Gospels*. In this way understood, we find no more occasion to do violence to the construction; every thing like ellipsis, or tautology, or incongruous combination, vanishes at once. Besides, the meaning given is entirely analogical, and not unfrequent; *αρχειν*, in the active voice, is *to govern*, *αρχεσθαι*, in the passive, *to be governed*. Just so, *αρχοντες και αρχομενοι*,

magistrates and subjects. Τῆς νυκτος προβλεπει, τι σοι ποιηθου-
σιν οι αρχομενοι, επειδαν ἡμερα γενηται: *At night provide work
for your subjects to do when it is day.* Cyropæd. lib. i. No critic
hesitates to admit even an uncommon acceptation, when it is the on-
ly acceptation which suits the words connected. Who questions the
propriety of rendering *πρασβαιν*, v. 13. *to exact*? Yet, though this
verb occurs in the N. T. upwards of thirty times, the verse mention-
ed is the only place wherein it can be so rendered. The argument
is stronger in the present case, as, by the meaning here given, which
is far from being uncommon, the construction also is unravelled.

² *As was supposed, ως ενομιζετο.* Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. *Ut putaba-
tur.* Sy. to the same purpose, *מסרה* Hey. *As was supposed accord-
ing to law.* Priestley's Harmony, *As he was by law allowed to be.*
In this he has adopted the explanation given by Bishop Pearce, in his
commentary and notes. I am not against preferring a less, to a
more, usual interpretation, when the former suits the scope of the
passage, and the latter does not. But, in the present instance, noth-
ing can suit better the scope of the passage, than the common accep-
tation of the verb *νομιζεσθαι*, which is, *to be thought, supposed, or
accounted.* The historian had, in the two preceding chapters, given
us an account of our Lord's miraculous conception by the power of
the Holy Spirit in the womb of a virgin. After having said so
much to satisfy us that Jesus was no son of Joseph, and now intro-
ducing the mention of him as his son, it was quite natural to insert
the clause, *ως ενομιζετο*, to show that, in this, he did not contradict
himself, but spoke only according to the current, though mistaken
opinion, of the country. But what the words, *allowed by law*, have
to do here, it would not be easy to conceive. One would imagine,
from them, that a claim of succession to Joseph had been made on
the part of Jesus, and opposed by the relations, but carried in a court
of law. This is one of those refinements in criticism, which make
men nauseate what is obvious, and pursue, through the mazes of
etymology, what was never imagined before. Be. who, as has been
observed, often errs in this way, has not discovered, here, any scope
for the indulgence of his favourite humour, but, like others, has ren-
dered the words, simply, *ut existimabatur.* As to the quotations
from Josephus, there is nothing parallel in the cases: besides, it will

readily be admitted, by critics, that the words *ευχας νενομισμενας*, are better rendered *the customary prayers*, than *the prayers appointed by law*. The passive *νομιζεσθαι* frequently corresponds to the *La. moris esse*: whereas, the proper expression in Gr. for *prayers appointed by law*, is *ευχας νομιμους*. The examples from classical authors, referred to in Wet. are all capable of being rendered by one or other of the two ordinary significations, *to be thought*, or *to be wont*. But, in such phrases as *ως ενομιζετο*, there is commonly a meaning appropriated, by use, to the words, taken jointly, from which there will not, perhaps, be found a single exception. Had it, therefore, been the sacred writer's intention to say what those interpreters would make him say, he would certainly have chosen another expression for conveying his sentiment than this, which, he must have been sensible, could not be understood otherwise than as it has always, till so late as the eighteenth century, been interpreted; for let it be observed, that this is one of the passages in which there was never discovered, by either commentators or interpreters, the shadow of a difficulty, and about which there was never before any difference of opinion or doubt.

36. *Son of Cainan*. Be. on the single authority of the Çam. in opposition to the united testimonies of MSS. and translations, has omitted this clause in his version. *Cainan* is not indeed in the Heb. genealogy of Abraham, Gen. xi. 12, 13. either in the Jewish copy or in the Samaritan, though it is in the version of the Seventy. But this is not the only place in which this Evangelist, who wrote in Gr. followed the old Gr. translation, even where it differed from the original Heb. But it is not the province of a translator of the Gospel, because he esteems the Heb. reading preferable to the Gr. to correct, by his own ideas, what he has reason to believe was written by the Evangelist.

CHAPTER IV.

2. *The Devil*. Diss. VI. P. I. § 1—6.

7. *It shall all be thine*, *εσται σου παντα*. In the much greater number of MSS. especially those of principal note, for *παντα* we read *πασα*, agreeing with *εξουσια*. Both the Sy. the Cop. the Eth.

and the Ara. versions, have read in the same manner. But the Vul. has *omnia*. Of printed editions, the Com. two of Stephens, Wechelius, Ben. Wet. Bowyer, read also *πασα*.

8. *Ἐπαγεπισω μου Σατανα*. This clause is not only wanting in some of the best MSS. but in the Sy. Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. and Eth. translations. Gro. observes, that before The. no ancient writer considered these words as belonging to this place. Mill agrees with Gro. in rejecting them. Wet. who is more scrupulous, chooses to retain them, though he rejects the particle *γαρ* immediately following, to which the introduction of this clause has probably given rise.

18. *Inasmuch as, ὅν ἐνεξεν*. E. T. *Because*. Vul. *Propter quod*. Cas. *Quandoquidem*. Dod. and others, *For the purpose to which*. The force of the conjunction is better hit by Cas. than either by the E. T. or by the Vul. and Dod. It is neither causal nor final so much as explanatory. Such is often the import of the Heb. *וּיִאגְחַן*, the word used by the prophet.

18, 19. Diss. V. P. II. § 2. Diss. VI. P. V. § 5.

19. The Vul. without the authority of MSS. adds to this verse, *et diem retributionis*; and in this is followed by the second Sy. Ara. Arm. and Sax. versions. A clause corresponding to it is indeed found in the prophet quoted; but in no Gr. MS. of L. except in a few belonging to the Marquis de los Veles, which, in Si.'s opinion, have been fabricated on the Vul. and are consequently of no authority in this question.

20. *To the servant, τῷ ὑπηρετῆρ*. E. T. *To the minister*. From the manner in which we apply the word *minister*, in our churches, the Eng. reader is apt to be led into a mistake by the common version, and to consider the word here as meaning the person who presided in the service; whereas, it denotes only a subordinate officer, who attended the minister, and obeyed his orders in what concerned the more servile part of the work. Amongst other things, he had the charge of the sacred books, and delivered them to those to whom he was commanded by his superiors to give them. After the reading was over, he deposited them in their proper place. This officer the Jews call *chazan*, who ought not to be confounded with *αρχισυνάγωγος*, ruler of the *synagogue*.

22. *All extolled him, παντες εμαρτυρουν αυτω.* E. T. *All bare him witness.* *Μαρτυρων τινι* commonly denotes, *to give one a favourable testimony; to praise, to extol, to commend:* as ch. xi. 48. Acts xiii. 22. Rom. x. 2. Here it is manifestly used in this sense. The phrase *bare him witness*, is both indefinite and obscure.

² *Words full of grace, τοις λογοις της χαριτος.* E. T. *The gracious words.* Dod. *The graceful words.* I took notice, on ch. ii. 40. that *gracious*, which is nearly synonymous to *kind*, does not suit the sense of this passage. I must say the same thing of *graceful*, which though one who judged from etymology, would think perfectly equivalent to *full of grace*, is not so in reality. *Graceful words* means, in approved use, no more than *well-sounding words*; whereas, in *words full of grace*, if I mistake not, there is always something implied in relation to their sense much more than to their sound.

34. *The holy One of God, ο άγιος του Θεου.* For the full import of the word *άγιος*, in its different applications, see Diss. VI. P. IV. It may be proper here, however, to remark, that when the word is used in the N. T. as an appellative with the article, in the singular number, and applied to a person, the application is always either to God or to Christ. Let it be observed, that I do not speak of the Heb. *חַסִּיד* *chased*, and the Gr. *όσιος*, but of *קדוש* *kalosh* and *άγιος*. This term is employed sometimes alone, to denote the true God, *ο άγιος* the holy One, and sometimes, particularly in the O. T. with the addition of the name of his people, *the holy One of Israel*. *Ο άγιος*, *the holy One*, or *the saint*, is, in like manner, appropriated, particularly in the N. T. to Jesus Christ, commonly with the addition of *του Θεου*. But, after the times of the Apostles, Christians became much more lavish of titles, and of this title in particular, than their predecessors had been. I have, therefore, chosen to follow our translators in rendering *ο άγιος* *the holy One*, rather than *the Saint*, a denomination which, in latter ages, has been so much prostituted, that, to say the least, a name so venerable, as that of Jesus, could derive no dignity from it.

36. *What meaneth this? that with authority and power he commandeth?* *τις ο λογος ουτος, οτι εν εξουσια και δυναμει επιτασσει;* E. T. *What a word is this? For with authority and power he*

commandeth. For the import of the conjunction *ὅτι*, in this place, see ch. i. 45. ² N.

39. *Standing near her, επιβτας επανω αυτης.* E. T. *He stood over her.* *Επανω*, in the sacred penmen, frequently answers to the Heb. *hy ghal*, which corresponds not only to the La. preposition *super*, but to *juxta*.

40. *After sunset, all they who had any sick*—because then the Sabbath was ended, and the people were at liberty to carry their sick.

41. *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, συ ει ο Χριστος ο υιος του Θεου.* Vul. *Tu es filius Dei.* *Ὁ Χριστος* is not in the Cam. and four other MSS. It has no place in the Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. versions, any more than in the Vul.

² *Would not allow them to speak, because they knew, ουκ εια αυτα λαλειν, ὅτι ηδεισαν.* Some say that the words may be rendered *Would not allow them to say that they knew*, interpreting the conjunction *ὅτι* as in verse 36. Had the Evangelist used *λεγειν* instead of *λελειν*, I should certainly have so translated the passage; but as these two verbs are not employed promiscuously in Gr. I thought it better to preserve the distinction in Eng.

42. *Sought him out, εξητουν αυτον.* E. T. *Sought him.* A very great number of MSS. and among these some of the most valuable, read *επεξητουν*. The difference in meaning is not considerable; but it is sufficient to warrant the distinction here made.

² *Urged him not to leave them, κατειχον αυτον του μη πορευεσθαι απ' αυτων.* E. T. *Stayed him that he should not depart from them.* In most translations, as well as in the Eng. the words are so rendered as to imply that they detained him by force. But that *κατειχω* does not always signify the possession or the attainment of the thing spoken of, is evident from this very writer's use of it, Acts xxvii. 40. *κατειχον εις τον αιγιαλον*, which our translators render, very justly, *made toward shore*. Here the verb expresses no more than the earnestness of their endeavours.

CHAPTER V.

2. *A ground near the edge, εστωτα παρα την λιμνην.* E. T. *Standing by the lake.* The word *εστωτα*, applied to a ship or boat, means either being *at anchor*, or being *aground*. The latter seems here the more probable meaning, for the following reasons: First, The *πλοια*, so often mentioned in the Gospel, though in the common version rendered *ships*, were, in reality (if we may judge from the account given of them by Josephus, who had good occasion to know, having had for some time the chief command in Galilee,) but a sort of large fishing boats. What we are told, v. 7. that the fishes taken filled both the vessels, insomuch that they were near sinking, is a strong confirmation of what we learn from him concerning their size. I have, therefore, in this and other places, after the translators of P. R. Si. Sa. Beau. L. Cl. and other Fr. interpreters, rendered the word *barks*, distinguishing the diminutive *πλοιαρια* by translating it *boats*. Even the largest of such vessels might easily be run aground or set afloat, as occasion required. Josephus calls them *σκαφη*, reckons about two hundred and thirty of them on the lake, and four or five men to each. Another reason for thinking that the word *εστωτα* here means rather *aground* than *at anchor*, is, because they are said to be, not *εν τη λιμνη*, but *παρα την λιμνην*. It is the same expression which is used in the preceding verse, concerning our Lord himself, and which, by consequence, must mean beside the water, rather than in it. Thirdly, Our Lord's desire, expressed in the third verse, to put off a little from the land, when his sole purpose was to teach the people, shows that they were so close upon the multitude as to be incommoded by them. This is also another evidence of the smallness of the vessels.

7. *So that they were near sinking, ωστε βυθιζεσθαι αυτα.* E. T. *So that they began to sink.* Vul. *Ita ut pæne mergerentur.* The Sy. version is conformable to the Vul. Common sense indeed shows, that *βυθιζεσθαι* cannot here be rigidly interpreted. In familiar language, words are often used with equal latitude.

9. *For the draught of fishes which they had taken, had filled him and all his companions with terror, θαυμος γαρ περιεσχευ*

αυτον και παντας τους συν αυτω, επι τη αγρα των ιχθυων η συνε-
 λαβον. E. T. For he was astonished, and all that were with him,
 at the draught of the fishes which they had taken. The word *as-*
tonished, in the common version, is far too weak for expressing the
 effect which we find this miracle produced upon Peter, and which
 evidently had in it more of *terror* than *astonishment*. I have, in v.
 8th, varied from my ordinary method, and rendered Κυριε, Lord,
 though addressed to Jesus before his resurrection. I think the man-
 ner in which Peter appears to have been affected, and the extraor-
 dinary petition he presented to a person of whose benevolence and
 humanity he had been so oft a witness, will justify this alteration, as
 they clearly show that he discovered in his Master, on this occasion,
 something superior to human, which quite overwhelmed him with
 awe and fear.

10. Thou shalt catch men, ανθρωπους ετη ζωγων. Dod. Thou
 shalt captivate men. But *captivate* is never applied to *fishes*. Con-
 sequently, by this rendering, the trope is destroyed; for ζωγωω is
 equally applicable to both. Besides, *to catch* expresses no more
 than an effect; and does not, of itself, imply any artifice in the
 means; just so ζωγωω expresses the effect, without either implying
 or excluding artifice.

26. Incredible things, παραδοξα. E. T. Strange things. This
 expression is rather feeble. Vul. *Mirabilia*. Er. Zu. Cas. *Incre-*
dibilia. Be. *Inopinata*. The import of the Gr. word is better hit
 by Er. Zu. and Cas. than by either of the other La. translators.
 The words used by Be. appears at first to be the most exact, because
 most conformable to etymology, παρα την δοξαν, but it is in fact the
 weakest of all, for *inopinatus* is no more than *unexpected*; now,
 to say a thing is unexpected, is not saying so much as it is *strange*.
 It may be observed in passing, that the term occurs in no other
 place of the N. T. and is not found in the version of the Seventy.

CHAPTER VI.

1. On the Sabbath called second-prime, εν Σαββατω δευτεροπρω-
 ωτω. E. T. On the second Sabbath after the first. Vul. Er. Zu.
 Cas. *Sabbato secundo primo*. Among the different explanations
 which are given of the term δευτεροπρωτος I find nothing but con-

jecture, and therefore think it is the safest way to render the word by one similarly formed in our language. This is what all the best translators have done in La. In the Sy. there is no word answering to it. The common version has, in this instance, neither followed the letter, nor given us words which convey any determinate sense.

7. *Watched, παρετηρουν αυτον.* But *αυτον* is wanting in a very great number of MSS. the Al. and some others of principal note, in several of the best editions, in the Vul. Go. and Sax. versions, &c. It is rejected both by Mill and by Wet.

9. *I would ask you, What is it lawful to do on the Sabbath? Good or ill? Επερωτησω υμας τι Εξεστι τοις Σαββατιν αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι.* E. T. *I will ask you one thing, Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good, or to do evil?* But a great many MSS. and printed editions, read the sentence as pointed in this manner, *Επερωτησω υμας Τι εξεστι τοις Σαββατιν; αγαθοποιησαι, η κακοποιησαι;* which, without any alteration on the words or letters, yields the sense here expressed. I have had occasion to observe that, in regard to the pointing, it cannot be denied that the critic is entitled to greater freedom of conjecture than in what concerns the words themselves. To show, however, that this manner of distinguishing the clauses is very ancient, it is proper to observe that both the Sy. versions and the Go. are made from the sentence divided in the manner just now exhibited. As to the import of the question it contains see Mr. iii. 4. N.

12. *In an oratory, εν τη προσευχη του Θεου.* E. T. *In prayer to God.* It is plain that by the known rules of construction, the words do not admit this interpretation. The common signification of *προσευχη* is indeed *prayer*; but both *προσευχη* and *δεησις*, a term of nearly the same import, are always, in the N. T. construed with the preposition *προς* before the object addressed. See Acts xii. 5. Rom. x. 1. xv. 30. Heb. v. 7. And when either term is followed by the genitive of a word, denoting a person, it is invariably the person praying, not the person prayed to. See Jam. v. 16. Rev. v. 8. viii. 3. Though the words occur in the Sep. and in the N.T. times without number, the genitive is not, in a single instance, employed to denote the being to whom supplication is made. Such a mode of interpreting would be subversive of the analogy of the language,

The only way of avoiding this error here is by assigning another meaning to the word *προσευχη*, and translating it *a house, or place of prayer, an oratory*. That there is undoubted authority for this meaning of the word, is shown by the examples produced by Wet. from Philo, Josephus, and others. L. uses it again in the same sense, Acts xvi. 13. 16. As the word, thus applied, peculiarly regarded the Jewish worship, it was as much appropriated as the word *συναγωγη*. In this acceptation, La. writers transferred it into their language. That line of Juvenal is well known, Sat. III.

“Ede ubi consistas, in qua te quæro proscucha.”

Now, when the meaning is a house of prayer, the expression *ἡ προσευχη του Θεου* is analogous to *ὁ οίκος του Θεου*, *the house of God*, and *το ἱερον του Θεου*, *the temple of God*. The definite article *ἡ* prefixed, though proper in the historian, speaking of a place known to those to whom his history was immediately addressed (for we generally say the church, where there is but one church,) it is not necessary in a translator to retain; for, to his readers, such circumstances must rather appear indefinite. The addition of *του Θεου* was necessary in Gr. to prevent ambiguity, its import is implied in the word *oratory* in Eng. These oratories, according to some, were enclosures fenced with walls, but without roof, not like the synagogues, and the temple, *ὁ ναος*, strictly so called; but in the open air, like the courts of the temple, which were comprehended under the general name *ἱερον*, and in respect of their destination, were also oratories or places of prayer. (Lewis, Orig. Heb. B. iii. Ch. 9.) Oratories were not erected in cities and villages, but in the fields, nigh some river, or in the mountains. They appear to have been more ancient than synagogues, and perhaps even than the temple.

15. *Called the zealous, τον καλουμενον ζηλωτην*. E. T. *Called zelotes*. As the Sy. word *Canaanite*, used in the parallel place in Mt. is susceptible of the same interpretation with the Gr. word used here, which may be understood either as an epithet or as a surname; and as it was not uncommon, in writing Gr. to translate the Oriental names by a word of the same import (thus Cephias is translated *Peter*, Thomas *Didymus*, Tabitha *Dorcus*;) it is very probable that this has happened in the present case. It is the more so, as there was, about that time, a party in Palestine, who distinguished themselves by the title *ζηλωται*, and who though, perhaps, actuated

by a pious intention in the beginning, soon degenerated, and became at last, the greatest scourge of their country, and the immediate cause of its ruin. But, at the time referred to by the Evangelist, as they had not perpetrated those crimes with which they are charged by the historian, nay, were favoured by the people as patriots, and men who burnt with zeal for religion; I thought it better to render *ξηλωτην* here *the zealous*, according to the meaning of the word; as it appears to have been the intention of the writer to acquaint us that this Simon had belonged formerly to the party so denominated. I have said *the zealous*, rather than *the zealot*, as this last term is never used by us but in a bad sense. And though, indeed, the atrocious actions of the *ξηλωται* brought at last the very name into disgrace, there is no reason to think that the mention of it here carries any unfavourable insinuation along with it. Mt. x. 4. N.

22. *Separate you from their society, απορισωσιν υμας, that is, Expel you from the synagogue, excommunicate you.*

² *Defame you, εκβαλωσι το ονομα υμων ως τονηρον. E. T. Cast out your name as evil. L. Cl. Beau. Vous diffamera.* These Fr. translators have, in my opinion, expressed the full import of this clause. The phrase *הוציא שם רע* *hotsia shem rang*, Deut. xxii. 19. (which corresponds to the Gr. expression above quoted) is a Heb. circumlocution for *defaming*, or raising and propagating an evil and false report. This interpretation, beside being more perspicuous, makes the words exactly coincide in sense with the parallel passage, Mt. v. 11. Now there is ground to think that the sentiment conveyed in both places is the same. For whether the Evangelists have given us two discourses, delivered at different times, or accounts a little diversified of the same discourse, the general coincidence of the sentiments is evident. It may be objected to the interpretation, here given, that there is, in one point, a dissimilarity in the expression used by Moses and that employed by L. there being nothing in the Heb. corresponding to the Gr. *ως*. But a small difference in the application of the phrases accounts entirely for this variation. In the passage quoted from the Pentateuch, there is no occasion for a pronoun; the expression is general and indefinite, *Because he hath brought up (strictly, set forth) an evil name on a virgin of Israel.*

In the Gr. of the Evangelist, the expression is definite and particular, being specially addressed to the hearers, and therefore conjoined with the pronoun of the second person. It is not *ονομα*, but *το ονομα υμων*, not *a name* in general, but *your name* in particular. If, therefore, *πονηρον* had followed without the *ως*, there would have been an implicit acknowledgment of the truth of the scandal, and their enemies would have been charged only with publishing it. As it stands, it entirely corresponds to the expression in Mt. *Accuse you falsely of every evil thing.*

24, 25, 26. *Wo unto you—Ουαι υμιν.* The form of expression in both languages, in these verses, so much coincides with what we are rarely accustomed to hear, except in passionate imprecations, that it is no wonder they should be, in some measure, misunderstood, by the majority of readers. That such words were often directed against those who were not only bad men, but the avowed enemies of our Lord, is a circumstance which heightens this appearance of imprecation, and renders it difficult for us to conceive otherwise of the expressions. Some have called them authoritative denunciations of judgments; but this, I am afraid, is but a softer way of expressing the same thing. Our Lord is not here acting in the character of judge, pronouncing sentence on the guilty, or dooming them to punishment. The office of judge is part of that glory to which he was not to be exalted till after his humiliation and sufferings. But he speaks here, in my apprehension, purely in the character of prophet, or teacher, divinely enlightened as to the consequences of men's actions, and whose zeal for their good obliged him to give them warning. But that this explanation may not appear merely conjectural, let the following considerations, for ascertaining the import of the interjection, be impartially attended to. The only satisfactory evidence, in such cases, is the actual application of the word. Now, as to its application in the instances before us, there are four classes against whom *woe* is pronounced. These are :—*the rich,—they that are full,—they who laugh,—they of whom men speak well.* Now, that we may apprehend more exactly the view with which they were uttered, let us consider the four classes (for they also are four,) in verses 20, 21, and 22, which are, with like solemnity, pronounced happy. These are :—*the poor,—they that hunger,—they that weep,—they of whom men speak ill.* No one can be at a loss to perceive that

these are manifestly and intentionally contrasted; the characters in the former class being no other than those of the latter reversed. And if so, by all the rules of interpretation, the mood or form of the sentence must be the same in both. Now as these *Μακαριοι οι πτωχοι, κ. τ. ε.* have ever been considered as declarative, and not as expressing a prayer or wish; the other must be understood in the same manner. The substantive verb, therefore, to be supplied (for in both cases it is, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom, wanting in the original,) is in the indicative, and not in the optative or the imperative. *Woe is unto you, not woe be unto you. Vox est, says Gro. dolentis, non ira incensi.* Again, let us consider a little the expression, Mt. xxiv. 19. in our Lord's prediction of the calamities coming on Jerusalem and the Jewish nation; *Ουαι ταις εν γαστρι εχουσαις, και ταις θηλαζουσαις εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις.* *Woe to the women with child, and to them that give suck in those days.* As nobody can be so foolish as to imagine that either pregnancy, or the suckling of children, are here exhibited as criminal; to understand this otherwise than as a declaration of the unhappiness of women in these circumstances, at such a time of general calamity, were absurd in an uncommon degree. The parallel passage in L. xxiii. 29. where we have the same prophecy, would remove every shadow of doubt as to the meaning, if it were possible that, to the attentive and judicious, there could be any: *The days are coming wherein they shall say, Happy the barren, the wombs which never bare, and the breasts which never gave suck.* That these words are declarative, is what no person ever called in question. If we recur to the O. T. we have the clearest proofs that the word in Heb. rendered *ουαι* in the Sep. is commonly employed to express not wrath and execration, but the deepest concern and lamentation. Accordingly we find, in several instances, the word construed with the pronoun of the first person, *ουαι ημιν*, and *ουαι μοι*, *woe unto us* and *woe unto me*; in which cases, to avoid ambiguity, our translators might have said always, as they have done in some places, *woe is us*, and *woe is me*, which, though perhaps too familiar for the solemn style of Scripture, exactly hits the sense of the original. But in those places, it must be owned, nobody seems to have mistaken the words for an imprecation. See 1 Sam. iv. 7, 8. Jer. iv. 13. vi. 4. Lam. v. 16. both in the Sep. and in the E. T. In fine, as *the*

Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; he came not to curse, but to bless us, by turning away every one of us from his iniquities. The words which proceeded out of his mouth were, in every sense, justly denominated *full of grace*. His example was perfectly conformable to his instructions; and I will venture to affirm that, the more narrowly we examine his discourses, the more we shall be convinced, that nothing he ever uttered against any living being, if candidly interpreted, will be found to bear any the least affinity to an imprecation. Wa. in his translation of Mt. renders *οαι*, ch. xi. 21. and in other places, *alas!* Thus: *Οαι σοι Χοραζην* is, with him, *Alas! for thee, Chorazin!* But though he has so far hit the sense, in making this particule an interjection of pity and grief, not of anger or resentment, there is a feebleness in the expression which ill befits the importance of the occasion. It would suit well enough for expressing a transient regret on account of some trilling accident; but so slight an indication of sorrow, in a matter of such ineffable consequence as that which affects men's eternal interests, has a worse effect, and looks more like insensibility, than the absence of every outward indication. The common rendering has this advantage, that it represents the subject as serious, yea, momentous: and as the use of the idiom, in other places of the E. T. as well as in the original, puts it beyond all doubt, that it is often the voice of lamentation, and not of wrath, I thought it, on the whole, better to retain it; and, for removing every appearance of ambiguity, to give this explanation in a note.

26. *When men shall speak well of you, όταν καλως υμας ειπωσι παντες οι ανθρωποι.* The word *παντες* is wanting in many MSS. some of them of principal note; and also in the Sy. Vul. Eth. and Ara. versions, as well as in several of the best editions and ancient commentators. Mill and Wet. both reject it.

35. *Nowise despairing, μηδεν απελπιζοντες.* E. T. *Hoping for nothing again.* Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Nihil inde sperantes.* Such a concurrence, in the La. interpreters, has ensured, as might have been expected, the imitation of all the first translators into modern European tongues; insomuch that this interpretation seems to have become, till of late, universal in the West. But from this the Sy. and Oriental versions differ considerably. I agree with Wet. and others, in rejecting it, because I see no reason for thinking that

απελπίζειν has ever, either in classical writers, or in sacred, any such meaning. This, indeed, is the only place in the N. T. where it occurs. The passive participle *απηλπισμενος*, is found once in the Sep. Is. xxix. 19. answering to a word signifying *indigent*, or, as we should say, *hopcless*. It is used, in the same sense, Judith ix. 11. The verb *απελπίζειν* occurs in three other places of the Apocryphal writings, but in none of them is susceptible of any other interpretation than to lose hope, to despond. This is also the classical sense of the word. The only reason I can discover, which has induced expositors to give it a contrary meaning, and to make it signify *to hope for something back*, seems to have been the notion that the verse, thus interpreted, makes the best contrast to the preceding words, *If ye lend to those only from whom ye hope to receive*— I acknowledge that, in the common version, there is the appearance of a stronger contrast, than in the translation which I have given ; but if it were so, this is not a sufficient reason for affixing a meaning to the word so unprecedented, especially when its ordinary acceptation suits the scope of the passage. Besides, the contrast, I suspect, is not so pointed as some imagine. *From whom ye hope to receive*, does not, in my notion, suggest the restitution of the loan, but the like good office in return. It is as if he had said, ‘ If ye lend to those only from whom ye yourselves may have occasion to borrow,’ — for this, it must be owned, is merely a selfish intercourse. But the very term, *to lend*, implies the stipulation of the return of what is lent (otherwise it would not be called *lent*, but *given* ;) nor does this stipulation annihilate the humanity of the action in lending money, especially to a very poor man, since the lender gratuitously gives the borrower the use of his property, while he himself runs the hazard of the loss. Let it be observed that, by lending, I do not mean, here, putting out money at interest ; for this is an affair merely commercial, and comes not, unless in particular circumstances, under the class of good offices. Now, had the verb *απελπίζω* been capable of the meaning which those interpreters assign to it, it would have been more apposite to subjoin *μηδεν απελπιζοντες* immediately after *αγαθοποιειτε*, leaving out *και δειξειτε* altogether for this, rather hurts the sense. Again, there are some who, sensible that *απελπίζειν* does not admit the interpretation which the Vul.

has given it, and that its ordinary meaning is *to despair*, think that, by a sort of Hebraism, it may be interpreted, here, actively, to cause to despair. These make a small alteration on the preceding word, saying, *μηδενα* (not *μεθεν*) *απελπιζοντες* *causing none to despair*, to wit, of relief when in straits. This gives a good sense, and not unsuitable to the scope of the context. But though some neuter verbs are, in the Hellenistic idiom, sometimes active, expressing the force of the Heb. conjugation *hiphil*, we have no evidence that this ever took place in this verb; for it cannot be affirmed, that it holds of all neuter verbs indiscriminately. Besides, there is no MS. which reads *μηδενα*, and there is no necessity, in the present case, for even a small deviation from the acknowledged reading, or from the ordinary acceptation of the words. In further support of the translation here given, let it be observed, that what commonly proves the greatest hindrance to our lending, particularly to needy persons, is the dread that we shall never be repaid. It is, I imagine, to prevent the influence of such an over-cautious mistrust, that our Lord here warns us not to shut our hearts against the request of a brother in difficulties. ‘Lend cheerfully,’ as though he had said, ‘without fearing the loss of what shall be thus bestowed. It often happens that, even contrary to appearances, the loan is thankfully returned by the borrower; but if it should not, remember (and let this silence all your doubts) that God chargeth himself with what you give from love to him, and love to your neighbour. He is the poor man’s surety.’ It may not be improper to add, that several La. MSS. read, agreeably to the interpretation here given, *nihil desperantes*. It is not impossible, that from *desperantes* has sprung, through the inadvertency, or haste, of some transcriber, the present reading *inde sperantes*.

37. *Release, and ye shall be released, απολυετε και απολυθησεθε*. E. T. *Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. Vul. Dimittite, et dimittimini*. Though the forgiveness of injuries is doubtless included in the precept, it ought not to be limited to this meaning. When these are specially intended, the word used by the Evangelists, particularly L. is *αφιημι*, not *απολυω*. The latter implies equally discharging from captivity, from prison, from debt. Of the like import is the La. *dimitto*.

CHAPTER VII.

5. *It was he who built, αυτος ωκοδομησεν.* E. T. *He hath built.* The pronoun *αυτος* is, here, evidently emphatical, being otherwise unnecessary. It is only in some such way as taken in this version, that the emphasis can be expressed in Eng. Diss. XII. P. I. § 32.

² *Our synagogue, την συναγωγην ημιν.* E. T. *Us a synagogue.* Had the expression in Gr. been *συναγωγην ημιν*, without the article, it could not have been more exactly rendered than as in the common translation; but, with the article, it evidently denotes, either that there was but one synagogue in that city, or that there was only one in which those elders were concerned. In either case, it ought to be *our synagogue*.

9. *Admired him, εθαυμασεν αυτον.* Vul. *Miratus est*; agreeably to which version the Cam. and two other MSS. omit *αυτον*. The Sax. also omits the pronoun.

11. *Accompanied by his disciples, σηηπορευοντο αυτων δι μαθηται αυτου ικανοι.* E. T. *Many of his disciples went with him.* But *ικανοι* is wanting in three of the principal MSS. and in the Sy. Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions, there is no word answering to it, it is, therefore, rejected by some critics.

16. *God hath visited his people, επεσκεψατο ο Θεος τον λαον αυτου.* But does not the Eng. *visited* sometimes mean *punished*? It does; and so does the Gr. *επεσκεψατο*. The distinction between the favourable, and the unfavourable meaning, is, in both languages, made easily, though solely, by the words in connexion.

29. *All the people.* I have marked this, and the following verse, as the words of Jesus. Some have, improperly, considered them as spoken by the Evangelist, acquainting us that the people who heard what Jesus said at this time, concerning John, glorified God, by an immediate recourse to John for baptism. But this cannot be the sense, for John was then as we learn from Mt. xi. 2. in prison, where he remained till his death, and so had it no longer in his pow-

er to baptize any. Besides, it was John's office to bring disciples to Jesus, whose harbinger he was, and not the office of Jesus to bring disciples to John.

² *Have honoured God, εδικαιωσαν τον Θεον.* E. T. *Justified God.* As this expression is obscure, some prefer, *have acknowledged the justice of God*; which, though favoured by etymology, does not reach the meaning. *Δικαιω* is doubtless from *δικαιος*, but does not here imply a vindication of God's justice, more than of his wisdom or goodness. This clause is a proper contrast to that which follows. As those who refused John's baptism, dishonoured God, by rejecting his counsel, those who received John's baptism, honoured God, by following his counsel.

30. *Have rejected the counsel of God with regard to themselves, την βουλην του Θεου ηθετησαν εις εαυτους.* E. T. *Rejected the counsel of God against themselves*; meaning, doubtless, *they against themselves* (that is, *to their own prejudice*.) *rejected the counsel of God.* This sense is good, but it is ambiguously expressed in the common translation. Our translators have also given, on the margin, another version, which is preferred by several. *They rejected within themselves the counsel of God.* I think, with Gro. that of the three senses given above, the first is worthy of the preference. The preposition *εις*, often denotes *with regard to, in relation to.* The second meaning, which is that of the common version, does not naturally arise from the words. And to say, *they rejected within themselves*, seems not very apposite to what follows in the sentence, which shows that the rejection was open and notorious.

31. *Ειπε δε ο Κυριος.* E. T. *And the Lord said.* But in Gr. this clause is wanting in almost all the MSS. both of great and of small account. It is in neither of the Sy. versions, nor in the Ara. Eth. Cop. and Sax. In many La. MSS. also, and ancient commentaries, it is not to be found. It is omitted by some of the best editors, and rejected by Gro. Mill, Wet. and other critics. If I might indulge a conjecture, as to what has given rise to the insertion of these words, I should say, that some reader mistaking the two preceding verses for the words of the historian, has thought some such clause necessary for preventing mistakes, by showing that our Lord, in what followed, resumed the discourse. The strong evidence which we have, that this is an interpolation, proves also, in some degree,

that there was no interruption in our Lord's discourse, and that, consequently, the two preceding verses are part of it.

35. *But wisdom is justified by all her children, και εδικαιωθη η σοφια απο των τεκνων αυτης παντων.* Cas. *Ita suis omnibus aliena sapientia.* This most extraordinary interpretation that author defends in a note on the parallel passage, Mt. xi. 19. The examples which he produces show, indeed, that *δικαιουν* sometimes means to release or deliver from evil or danger; and to this its most common signification is nearly related. *To justify*, (which is, originally, a law term, and coincides with *to acquit, to absolve*,) necessarily implies deliverance from the evil of a criminal accusation, and the danger of punishment. But this is very different from the sense given, in his translation, of this verse, which is, *alienated from, averse to*. Had his rendering been *liberata, or soluta est sapientia*, his quotations would have been a little more to the purpose. Elsner goes still farther, and maintains that *εδικαιωθη* ought here to be rendered, *is condemned*. And for this signification he produces, as vouchers, Euripides and Thucydides, the purity of whose language, if that concerned the present question, will not be disputed. But it is surprising, that though *δικαιουν* is one of the most common verbs in the N. T. in the Gr. version of the Old, and in the Apocryphal books, written in the idiom of the synagogue, a single example has not been found in any of these to support an interpretation so foreign to the manner of the sacred writers, who confessedly, in every other instance, employ the term in a favourable meaning, and with very little difference of signification. The uniformity on this head is, indeed, so great, that it is not easy to conceive any one of them using it in a sense so contrary to its universal acceptation among them, without, at the same time, supposing him to have intended either to mislead his readers, or to express himself so as not to be understood by them. For, must he not have been sensible that, if he had intended to say *justified, vindicated*, *εδικαιωθη* is the very term he would have used? We have all the reason in the world to think so from their uniform practice. Now, could any man in his senses, who seriously designed to speak intelligibly, use the same term for expressing things so opposite as *to justify*, and *to condemn*? Was it that the language afforded no term appropriated to this last signification? The want of proper words sometimes, no doubt, occasions

the recourse to such as are equivocal. But there was no want here; *κατακρινειν, καταδικαζειν, καταγινωσκειν*, were quite suitable, and in familiar use. To conclude; the gross impropriety of using *δικαιουν* here for *to condemn*, would have been the more glaring, as the same verb had been used in this very discourse, v. 29. (a passage to which the present bears a manifest reference) in its ordinary acceptation. I need scarcely add, that I am of the opinion of Gro. on this point, that what is called *the counsel of God*, v. 30. is here denominated, *wisdom*, and that by *her children* are not meant the wise and learned, in the world's account, such as their scribes and doctors of the law, a race remarkably arrogant and contemptuous; but the unassuming, the humble, and the pious inquirers into the will of God. This interpretation, which is the most obvious to a translator, because resulting from the most common acceptation of the words, appears to me the most perspicuous in itself, and the best suited to the scope of the discourse.

38. *Standing behind.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3, 4, 5, 6.

² *Weeping, κλαιουσα.* This word is wanting in one Gr. MS. and is not rendered in the Vul. nor the Sax.

45. *Since she entered, απ' ης εισελθον.* E. T. *Since the time I came in.* I have, in this instance, ventured to give the preference to the reading which has the weaker support of MSS. (for they are but a few, and not the most considerable, which read *εισηλθεν*); first, on account of the authority which the most ancient and respectable translations give it; for thus the Vul. both the Sy. and the Cop. read: Secondly, because the difference in writing is so inconsiderable, that the smallest inadvertency, either in copying, or in attending to what is dictated by another, may account for it; the whole arising from the mistake of one small letter for another, the ε for the ο; Thirdly, because there is greater internal probability in the reading of the Vul. from its agreeing better with the context, which represents the woman as coming to Simon's house (v. 37.) after she had learnt that Jesus was there. Now, if Jesus was there before her, the action could be dated only from her entering, not from his. So slight a circumstance as this in the connexion is very apt to be overlooked in the hurry of transcribing, especially when the words themselves read well enough either way. But, where the dif-

ference in writing is more considerable, a reading ought not to be so easily admitted in favour of the scope of the place, against a great plurality of MSS. because, in this case, the alteration cannot be so plausibly charged on oversight.

47. *Therefore her love is great, ὅτι ἠγαπήσῃ πολυ.* E. T. *For she loved much.* Beau. *C'est pour cela qu'elle a tant aimé.* The whole context shows that the particle ὅτι is illative and not causal in this place. The parable of the debtors clearly represents the gratuitous forgiveness as the cause of the love, not the love as the cause of the forgiveness. And this, on the other hand, is, v. 50th, ascribed to her faith. This interchange of the conjunctions ὅτι and διότι, in the scriptural idiom, has been well illustrated by Ham. Wh. and Markland. See Bowyer's conjectures.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. *Proclaiming the joyful tidings of the reign of God, κηρυσσῶν καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* The import of both the participles here used is fully expressed in the version; only the latter points more directly to the nature of the message, *joyful tidings*, the former to the manner of executing it, to wit, by proclamation. Diss. VI. P. V.

15. *Persevere in bringing forth fruit, καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.* E. T. *Bring forth fruit with patience.* Ὑπομονή is, in the common version, generally rendered *patience*, for the most part, feebly, and in this and some other places, improperly. *Patience*, in the ordinary acceptation, is a virtue merely passive, and consists in suffering evil with equanimity. The Gr. ὑπομονή implies much more; and, though the sense now mentioned is not excluded, it generally denotes an active quality, to wit, constancy in purpose and practice. It corresponds exactly to what is with us called *perseverance*. The word, in Scripture, which strictly answers to the Eng. term *patience*, is μακροθυμία, commonly rendered *long-suffering*, and but twice *patience*. In several such instances, when an Eng. appellative is directly formed from the La. our translators, with other moderns, have implicitly followed the Vul. which says here, *Fructum afferunt in patientia*; nor is this the only place wherein

ὑπομονη is so rendered in that translation. Now, it deserves our notice that, though the other La. interpreters have in this copied the Vul. they appear sensible that they have not expressed sufficiently the import of the original, and have therefore corrected their own version on the margin, or in the notes. Thus Be. who renders *ἐν ὑπομονη* here *cum patientia*, says, in a note, “ad verbum *cum persistentia*.” Now, though *persistentia* is not a La. word, and therefore might not have been judged proper to be admitted into his translation, yet, as being formed from *persisto*, in like manner as *ὑπομονη* from *ὑπομενω*, answering to *persisto*, it can only mean *perseverance*, constancy, and ought to have been rendered *perseverantia*, which is at once classical La. and expressive of the sense, and consequently not liable to the objections which may be pleaded against either of those. Nor is Be. singular in using the word *patientia*, though sensible that it does not convey the meaning. The words in L. xxi. 19. *ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ κτησασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*, Cas. thus renders, both obscurely and improperly, and in no respect literally, *Vestrâ patientiâ vestræ salutî consulite*, putting on the margin, *Perseverate ad extremum, et salvi eritis*, which is a just interpretation of the Gr. and ought to have been in the text. This conduct of Cas. is the more unaccountable, as he never affects to trace the words or the construction, but seems to have it for a constant rule, overlooking every other circumstance, to express the sense of his author in classical and perspicuous La. But I can see no reason why *patientia* should be considered as a literal version of *ὑπομονη*, unless the custom of finding the one in the Vul. where the other is in the Gr. has served instead of a reason. *ὑπομονη* is a derivative from *ὑπομενω*, as *patientia* from *patior*; but *ὑπομενω*, is never rendered *patior*, else I should have thought that an immoderate attention to etymology (which has great influence on literal translators) had given rise to it. It is, on the other hand, not to be denied, that *patience* is, in some places, the proper version of *ὑπομονη*; nor is it difficult, from the connexion, to discover when that term expresses the sense. For example, when it is spoken of as necessary in affliction, under temptation, or during the delay of any promised good, nobody is at a loss to discover what is the virtue recommended. But where there is nothing in the context to limit it in this manner,

it ought to be rendered by some such word as *perseverance*, *continuance*, *constancy*; and, considering the ordinary import of the verb ὑπομενω, this may be called a more literal, because a more analogical, as well as a more exact, interpretation than the other. The impropriety of the common rendering is, in some places, manifest. How awkwardly is δὲ ὑπομονῆς τρεχόμεν (Heb. xii. 3.) represented by *Let us run with patience*? So passive a quality as patience is ill adapted to express the unintermitted activity exerted in running. Better, *Let us run without intermission*. And to produce but one other example from the same epistle, x. 36. Ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἐχετε χρεῖαν, ἵνα το θελημα του Θεου ποιησαντες, κομισθηθε την επαγγελιαν, which, in the common version, runs thus, *For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye may receive the promise*. Here not only is the expression weak and obscure, but the sentiment is different. It must be owned, however, that this rendering of ὑπομονη is not the only thing exceptionable in the translation of the sentence. Χρεια, in such phrases, generally implies more than is denoted by our word *need*, or by the La. word *opus*. It expresses not only what is useful, but what is necessary, what cannot be dispensed with. For this reason, I prefer the expression of the Vul. *Patientia enim vobis necessaria est*, to that of Be. *Nam patiente animo vobis est opus*. Another error is in the rendering επαγγελια in this place *promise*, and not *promised reward*, agreeably to a very common Heb. idiom. The sense evidently is, *For ye must persevere in doing the will of God, that ye may obtain the promised reward*.

26. *Gadarenes*, Γαδαρηνων. Vul. *Gerasenorem*. The only vouchers the Cam. MS. and Sax. version. Mt. viii. 28. N.

27. *A man of the city*, ανηρ τις εκ της πολεις. The import of which is evidently here, 'a man belonging to the city,' not 'a man coming from the city.' The Vul. says simply, *vir quidam*, but has nothing to answer to εκ της πολεις. In this it is followed by the Sax. only.

² *Demons*, δαιμονια. Vul. *Dæmonium*. As in this diversity also, the Vul. has no support from either MSS. or versions, it is enough to mention it.

31. *The abyss*, την αβυσσον. E. T. *The deep*. The meaning of this word in Eng. is invariably *the sea*. In this sense it occurs

often in Scripture. We find it in this Gospel, ch. v. 4. where the Gr. word rendered *the deep* is *το βαθος*. That the sea is not meant here is evident; for to the sea the demons went of themselves, when permitted, at their own request, to enter into the swine. For the proper import of the word *abyss*, in the Jewish use, see Diss. VI. P. II. § 14.

34. *Fled, and spread the news*, *εφυγον και απελθοντες απηγγειλαν*. E. T. *Fled, and went and told*. But the word *απηλθοντες*, answering to *went*, is wanting in almost all the MSS. of any account, in the Vul. both the Sy. the Go. the Sax. Cop. and Ara. versions, in some of the most eminent editions, and is generally rejected by critics.

36. *In what manner the demoniac had been delivered*, *πως εβωθη ο δαιμονισθεις*. Vul. *Quomodo sanus factus esset a legione*. This reading appears to be equally unsupported with the two former.

41. *A ruler of the synagogue—to wit, of Capernaum*.

47. *Having thrown herself prostrate, declared to him, before all the people, why she had touched him*, *προσπεδουσα αυτω δι' ην αιτιαν ηψατω αυτου, απηγγειλεν αυτω, ενωπιον παντος του λαου*. E. T. *Falling down before him, she declared unto him, before all the people, for what cause she had touched him*. As the second *αυτω* is not found in several MSS. some of them of note; as there is nothing which corresponds to it in these ancient translations, the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. and the Cop. and as it seems rather superfluous, I have omitted it in this version, taking the first *αυτω* to be governed by the verb *απηγγειλεν*.

48. *Take courage*, *θαρσει*. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and there is nothing corresponding to it in the Vul. Sax. and Cop. versions.

51. *Being come to the house*, *εισελθων δε εις την οικιαν*. E. T. *And when he came into the house*. But the greater number of MSS. especially those of principal note, read *ελθων* simply. This has also been read by the authors of the Vul. of both the Sy. the Ara. the Go. and the Sax. versions. It is in some of the best editions, and is approved by Mill and Wet. The other reading seems not quite consistent with the following part of the verse.

² *Peter, and John, and James.* E. T. *Peter, and James, and John.* The copies, evangelistaries, La. MSS. editions, and versions, which, in exhibiting these names, follow the first order, both out-number and out-weigh those which follow the second. I acknowledge that it is a matter of very little consequence which of the two has been the original order; but as the arrangement here adopted is peculiar to this Evangelist (for it occurs again, ch. ix. 28.; whereas both Mt. and Mr. say always *James and John*), I thought it safer, where possible, to preserve the peculiarities of each, even in the smallest matters.

54. *Having made them all retire,* εβαλων εξω παντας. These words are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. The clause is wanting also in the Vul. the Sax. and the Eth. versions.

CHAPTER IX.

1. *The twelve,* τούς δωδεκά μαθητας αυτου. E. T. *His twelve disciples.* The words *μαθητας αυτου* are wanting in a very great number of MSS. some of them of chief note, and in several of the oldest editions. They are not in the first Sy. nor in some modern versions, as Lu.'s and the Tigurine. It is to be observed, that even the other ancient versions, the Vul. the second Sy. the Go. the Sax. the Cop. have not read *μαθητας*, but *αποστολους*. This reading is also favoured by a few Gr. MSS. of little account. When the evidence of these different readings is compared together, the superiority is manifestly for the rejection of the two words. They are, besides, quite unnecessary.

3. *Nor staves,* μητε ραβδους. Vul. *Neque virgam.* In this reading the Vul. has the sanction of a good number of MSS. and of the Sy. Eth. and Ara. versions. The balance, however, is against it.

4. *Continue in whatever house ye are received into, until ye leave the place,* εις ην αν οικιαν ειβελθητε, εκει μενετε, και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε. E. T. *Whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart.* This way of rendering, though it appears to be literal, is very unintelligible, and conveys no determinate meaning. It seems even to be self-contradictory. Vul. *In quacunque*

domum intraveritis, ibi manete, et inde non exeatis. There can be no doubt that the authors of this version have read *μη* before *εξερχεσθε*; which is, indeed, found in one MS. but has no other authority that I know. The authors of the Sax. and the Cop. versions, seem, instead of the clause, *και εκειθεν εξερχεσθε*, to have read *εως αν εξελθητε*. We may, indeed, say with truth that, whether they read so or not, it was impossible, in a consistency with the scope and connexion, to render the sentence otherwise than they have done. The parallel places in like manner confirm the opinion that this must be the sense of the expression.

23. *Daily, καθ' ημεραν.* These words are wanting in so many and so considerable MSS. and are found in so many others, as might make one justly hesitate whether to retain or to reject them. All the ancient versions, however, except the second Sy. favour their admission; and even that version does not exclude them; it receives them only with a mark as dubious. There is nothing, indeed, corresponding to them in the two parallel passages of the other Gospels; but that is no objection, as there is nothing in either, which, in the smallest degree, contradicts them; and it is common, in the different Evangelists, to supply circumstances overlooked by the others. Besides, there is nothing in them unsuitable to the sense. As to follow Christ is the constant or daily business of his disciple, every attendant circumstance must share in that constancy. Upon the whole, the word *daily* possesses a place in the E. T. and we can say at least, that there does not appear ground sufficient for dispossessing it. Diss. XII. P. II. § 15.

28. *Εγενετο δε—και παραλαβων—* This is a mode of construction not unusual with this Evangelist. The *και* is redundant, as in ch. viii. l. x. 38. and xxiii. 44. or it may be rendered into Eng. by the conjunction *that*. *It happened that*: *ωσει ημεραι οκτω* may, doubtless, as Elsner proposes, be included in a parenthesis.

31. *The departure, την εξοδον.* E. T. *The decease.* Though some have put a different meaning upon the words, it was, doubtless, our Lord's *death* which was the subject of their discourse. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that the word *εξοδος* does not necessarily imply this, it being the term by which the departure of the Israelites from Egypt was commonly expressed, and the name given by the Seventy to the second book of Moses.

As it may not have been without design, that the common names for *death*, θάνατος and τελευτη, were avoided by the Evangelist, I thought it better to use here the word *departure*, which is of equal latitude with that of the original.

34. *And the disciples feared, when those men entered the cloud, εφοβηθησαν δε εν τω εκεινους εισελθειν εις την νεφελην.* E. T. *And they feared, as they entered into the cloud.* This expression evidently implies that they were the same persons who feared, and who entered into the cloud. The Gr. not less evidently, by means of the pronoun *εκεινους*, implies that they were different persons. I know not how I had overlooked this circumstance, till it was pointed out by Dr. Symonds. Diss. XII. P. I. § 81.

45. *It was veiled to them that they might not apprehend it, ην παρακεκαλυμμενον απ' αυτων, ινα μη αισθωνται αυτο.* E. T. *It was hid from them, that they perceived it not.* The words are susceptible of either interpretation; for though the common signification of *ινα* is *to the end that*, yet, in the N. T. it frequently denotes no more than *so that*. Here, however, the former clause appears to me so strongly expressed, as to justify the translation I have given of both. If the historian had employed an adjective, as *ασαφης*, or *κρυπτος*, and not the passive participle of an active verb, *παρακεκαλυμμενον* the conjunction might, with greater probability, have been interpreted *so that*. But, as it stands, it seems to express something intentional. Nor let it be imagined that this criticism is a mere refinement. Who would not be sensible of the difference, in Eng. between saying that an expression is *dark*, and saying that it has been *darkened*, or made dark? Now this is very similar to the case in hand. Allow me to add, that there is no impropriety in supposing that predictions were intentionally expressed so as not to be perfectly understood at the time; but so as to make an impression, which would secure their being remembered till the accomplishment should dispel every doubt. Diss. XII. P. II. § 11 and 12.

48. *He who is least among you all, shall be greatest, ο μικροτερος εν τασιν υμιν υπαρχων ουτος εσται μεγας.* Vul. *Qui minor est inter vos omnes, hic major est.* E. T. *He that is least among you all, the same shall be great.* By a very common Hebraism, the positive supplies the place, sometimes of the comparative, sometimes of the superlative. Thus, Gen. i. 16. *God made*

two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night. So the words are rendered in the Eng. Bible. In Heb. it is *the great light* and *the little light*. In the version of the Seventy, the former clause is expressed thus, *τον φωστηρα τον μεγαν εις αρχας της ημερας*. Again, Mt. xxii. 36. *Which is the greatest commandment in the law? ποια εντολη μεγαλη εν τω νομω*; And, in regard to the passage now under examination, as the contention among the disciples was, which of them should be *the greatest* (for, doubtless, they expected that they should all be *great*), there can be no reasonable doubt about the import of the term.

50. *Whoever is not against us, is for us, ος ουκ εστι καθ' ημων υπερ ημων εστιν*. A considerable number of MSS. and some of principal note, read *υμων* in both places. It is in this way rendered by the Vul. both the Sy. Go. Sax. Eth. and Ara. versions. But, though this should be thought to render the true reading doubtful, one thing is clear, that the difference does not affect the sense.

51. *As the time of his removal approached, εγενετο δε εν τω συμπληρουσθαι τας ημερας της αναληψεως αυτου*. E. T. *And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up*. *Αναληψις* does not occur in any other place of the N. T.; nor is it found in the Sep.; but being derived from *αναλαμβάνω*, which is used pretty often in both, we can hardly be at a loss about the signification. The verb admits a good deal of latitude; for though it is sometimes, in the passive voice, applied to our Saviour's assumption into heaven, and signifies to be taken up; it is not confined, in the N. T. to that meaning, and has but rarely such an acceptation in the Gr. of the Seventy. The old La. translator, who renders *αναληψις*, here, *assumptio*, has probably meant this; and to this effect our Eng. translators have, still more explicitly, rendered *τας ημερας της αναληψεως αυτου*, *the time that he should be received up*. Yet, to me, it appears very improbable that the Evangelist should speak of the time of his ascension as being come, or just at hand, not only before his resurrection, but even before his trial and death; especially, considering that he continued no fewer than forty days on the earth after he was risen. The word *αναληψις* is equally applicable to any other method of removing. Accordingly, some Fr. trans-

lators, even from the Vul. have understood the *dies assumptionis ejus* of his death. Both in the P. R. version, and in Sa.'s, it is rendered, *Le tems auquel il devoit etre élevé du monde*. From these Si. differs, only in saying,——*de ce monde*. But though this probably expresses the meaning, yet, as it is more explicit than the words of the Evangelist, I have preferred a simpler manner, and used a term of nearly the same extent of signification with the Gr. The word *συμπληροσθαι*, in strictness, denotes that the time *was come*. But we all know that, in popular language, a time is often said to be come which is very near. Besides, whatever be *the removal* alluded to, the circumstances closely connected with it, or introductory to it, may well be understood as comprehended. This seems strongly indicated here, by the indefinite turn of the expression, *τας ήμερας, the days, της αναληψεως αυτου*; whereas the actual removal, whether by death, or by ascension, occupied but a small part of one day.

52. *A village, χωμην. Vul. Civitatem.* A few inconsiderable MSS. with The. read *πολιν*.

54. *As Elijah did, ως και Ηλιας εποιησε.* This clause is wanting in two MSS. and in the Vul. and Sax. versions.

62. *No man who, having put his hand to the plough, looketh behind him; is fit for the kingdom of God.* The first member of this sentence is no more than a proverbial expression for a certain character, one, to wit, who, whilst he is engaged in a work of importance, allows his attention to be distracted by things foreign. The import is that those of this description were unfit for that spiritual service in which the disciples of Jesus were to be employed. There is an implicit comparison couched in the words, but not formally proposed, as in the parables.

CHAPTER X.

1. *Seventy others, ετερον, εβδομηκοντα. E. T. Other Seventy.* But this expression implies that there were seventy sent before. Now, this is not the fact (those sent before being no more than twelve), nor is it implied in the Gr. So inconsiderable a difference in the words makes a great alteration in the sense.

² *Seventy*, ἐβδομηκοντα. Vul. *Septuaginta duos*. Thus also the Sax. The Vat. the Cam. and one other MS. read οβ, which is the numeral mark for 72.

4. *Salute no person by the way*;—Let not matters of mere compliment detain you.

6. *If a son of peace be there*, εαν μεν η εκει ο υιος ειρηνης. E. T. *If the son of peace be there*. The article before υιος is wanting in many MSS. some of them of great name, in all the best editions, and in the comments of several Fathers. As to ancient versions, this is one of those particulars, about which we cannot safely determine, whether they read the one way or the other. Neither the Sy. nor the La. has articles; and those languages which have them do not perfectly coincide with one another in the use of them. In the present case, the scope of the passage clearly shows that the word is used indefinitely. *Son of peace*, here, is equivalent to *worthy* in the parallel passage in Mt. The import, therefore, is, manifestly, ‘If a person of worth, or deserving your good wishes, be there.’

17. *The Seventy*. The Cam. MS. the Vul. and the Sax. make them *seventy-two*, as in v. 1.

20. *Rejoice*, χαιρετε. The word μαλλον, *rather*, which is in the common edition, is wanting in almost all the MSS. editions versions, &c. of any consideration, and is, therefore, justly rejected by critics.

21. *In spirit*, τω πνευματι. The Cam. and five others, prefix αγω. The Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. Arm. Eth. and Sax. read so.

23. *Apart*, και' ιδιαν. This is wanting in the Cam. and is not rendered in the Vul. nor in the Sax. There is no other authority, that I know, for the omission.

30. *A man of Jerusalem travelling to Jericho*, ανθρωπος τις κατεβαινεν απο Ιερουσαλημ εις Ιεριχω. E. T. *A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho*. It cannot be denied that this is a close translation of the words as they lie; and that, in the version here adopted, there is greater freedom taken with the arrangement. But, in my opinion, it is not greater than the scope of the place, and the practice of the sacred writers, will warrant. As to the scope of the passagè, every body perceives

that it is the intention of this parable to confound those malignant Jewish prejudices, which made them confine their charity to those of their own nation and religion. Nor could any thing be better adapted for the purpose than this story, which, as it is universally understood, exhibits a Samaritan overlooking all national and religious differences, and doing offices of kindness and humanity to a Jew in distress. By this means, the narrow-minded Pharisee, who put the question, is surprised into a conviction, that there is something amiable, and even divine, in surmounting all partial considerations, and listening to the voice of nature, which is the voice of God, in giving relief to the unhappy. Now, the whole energy of the story depends on this circumstance, that the person, who received the charitable aid, was a Jew, and the person who gave it a Samaritan. Yet, if we do not transpose the *κατεβαινεν*, in this verse, and make it follow, instead of preceding, *απο Ιερουσαλημ*, we shall be apt to lose sight of the principal view. The use of *απο*, for denoting the place to which a person belonged, is common: *Ανθρωπος απο Αριμαθειας*, Mt. xxvii. 57. *Λαζαρος απο Βηθανιας*, J. xi. 1. As to the transposition, instances much greater than the present, have been taken notice of already; and other instances will occur in these notes. Mt. xv. 1. N. See Bowyer's conjectures.

32. *Likewise a Levite on the road, when he came near the place, and saw him, passed by on the farther side, ομοιως δε και λευιτης, γενομενος κατα τον τοπον, ελθων, μαι ιδων, αντιπαρηλθεν.* E. T. *And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side.* There are some strange inaccuracies in this version. It may be asked, Whither did the Levite come, when he was already at the place? Or, how does this coming and looking on the wounded man, consist with his passing by on the other side? Indeed, the word *ελθων*, in the original, appears redundant, and is wanting in a few MSS. as well as in the Vul. The word *ιδων*, is badly rendered *looked on*. A man is often passive, in seeing what he does not choose to see, if he could avoid it. But *to look on* implies activity and attention. I have, in this version, expressed the sense, without attaching myself servilely to the words. In rendering *αντιπαρηλθεν*, I have preferred Be.'s *ex adverso præterit*, to the *pertransivit* of the Vul. It appears to me, that it is not without design that this unusual

compound, *αντιπαρερχεσθαι*, applied to the priest and the Levite, is here contrasted to the *προσερχεσθαι*, applied to the Samaritan. This is the more probable, as it is solely in this place that the former verb occurs in Scripture; whereas *παρερχεσθαι* occurs frequently in the sacred writers, and in none oftener than in this Evangelist, as signifying to pass on, to pass by, or pass away. Add to all, that this meaning of the preposition *αντι*, in compound verbs, is common, and the interpretation analogical. Besides, the circumstance suggested is not only suitable to the whole spirit of the parable, but natural and picturesque.

34. *Πανδοχειον*. ch. ii. 7. ² N.

35. *When he was going away*, *εξελθων*. This word is wanting in the Cam. and three other MSS. and is not rendered in the Vul. Sy. Eth. Sax. and Ara. versions.

42. *The good part*. I had in the former edition, after the E. T. said *that good part*. It has been remarked to me, by a friend, that the pronoun seems to make the expression refer to the *one thing necessary*. I am sensible of the justness of the remark, and therefore now, literally follow the Gr. *την αγαθην μεριδα*.

CHAPTER XI.

2. 4. The words, in these verses, inclosed in crotchets, have nothing in the Vul. corresponding to them, nor in the Arm. version. They are wanting also in several MSS. Some of the Fathers have given what I may call, a negative testimony against their admission, by omitting them in those places of their works where we should have expected to find them; but Origen's testimony against them is more positive: for he says, expressly, of some of those clauses and petitions, that they are in Mt. but not in L. It deserves to be remarked, also, that he does not say (though in these matters he is wont to be accurate) that those expressions are not found in many copies of L.'s gospel, but simply, that L. has them not. This would lead one to think, that he had not found them in any transcript of that Gospel which had come under his notice, though far the most eminent scriptural critic of his time; and that they were, consequently,

an interpolation of a later date. Whatever be in this, some of our best modern critics, Gro. Ben. Mill, and Wet. seem to be agreed that, in this place, we are indebted for them to some bold transcribers, who have considered it as a necessary correction, to supply what they thought deficient in one Gospel out of another. See the notes on Mt. vi. 10, &c.

3. *Each day, το καθ' ἡμέραν.* Instead of this, the Cam. and six other MSS. read *σήμερον.* Thus, the author of the Vul. has read, who says *hodie.* This is also followed by the Sax. version. Yet, in no other part of this prayer does that version follow the Vul. but the Gr.

6. *Off his road. ἐξ ὁδοῦ.* E. T. *In his journey.* The translation, here given, is evidently closer; besides, it strengthens the argument.

7. *I and my children are in bed, τα παιδια μου, μετ' εμου, εις την κοιτην ειδιν.* E. T. *My children are with me in bed.* That *μετ' εμου* does not necessarily imply that he and his children were in the same bed, but only that the children were gone to bed as well as he, has been shown by many critics. I shall, therefore, only refer the Gr. student to the following, amongst other passages which might be quoted, wherein, if he look into the original, he will find that the prepositions, *μετα* and *συν*, often denote no more than the former of these, in the interpretation above given, denotes here, Mt. ii. 3. 1 Cor. xvi. 11. Eph. iii. 18.

8. *If the other continue knocking.* Vul. *Si ille perseveraverit pulsans.* Words corresponding to these are not found either in the Gr. or in the Sy. Nor can we plead the authority of MSS. The best argument in their favour is, that they seem necessary to the sense; for a man could not be said to be importunate, for having asked a favour only once. As the passage, therefore, needed the aid of some words, and as these are adapted to the purpose, and have been long in possession; for the old Itc. and the Sax. versions read so, as well as the Vul. I thought it better to retain them, adding the mark by which I distinguish words inserted for the sake of perspicuity, from those of the inspired pennien.

13. *How much more will your Father give from heaven, ποσῶ μαλλον ὁ πατηρ ὁ ἐξ ουρανοῦ δωσει.* E. T. *How much more shall*

your heavenly Father give. Vul. *Quanto magis Pater vester de cælo dabit.* Thus we read in the edition authorized by Pope Sixtus Quintus; whereas, after Pope Clement's corrections, it is *pater cælestis*; but in three old editions, one published at Venice in 1484, another at Paris in 1504, the third at Lyons in 1512, we have both readings conjoined, *Pater vester cælestis de cælo dabit*, with a note on the margin of the last, insinuating that some copies have not the word *cælestis*. The Sy. reads exactly as the Vul. of Sixtus Quintus. So do also the Cop. and the Sax. Some Gr. MSS. likewise omit the *ὁ*, and read *ὑμῶν* after *πατηρ*. This makes the most natural expression, and appears to have been the reading of the most ancient translators. Gro. and some other critics, have thought that *πατηρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, is equivalent to *πατηρ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, or *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. I can find no evidence of this opinion. Such a periphrasis for God, in this or any other sacred writer, is without example; and the expressions which have been produced, as similar, are not apposite. I see no reason for imputing so strange an affectation to the Evangelist. I have, therefore, followed the Sy. which differs in nothing from the common Gr. except in reading *ὑμῶν* after *πατηρ*, instead of *ὁ*.

² *The holy Spirit, πνευμα ἅγιον.* Vul. *Spiritum bonum.* The Cam. *αγαθὸν δῶμα*, three others, *πνευμα αγαθον*, agreeably to the Vul. Eth. Sax. and Arm. versions.

17. *One family falling after another, και οικος επι οικον πιπτει.* E. T. *And a house divided against a house falleth.* Vul. *Et domus supra domum cadit.* Er. and Cas. to the same purpose. Our translators have, by following Be. imperfectly, been drawn into the hardly intelligible version they have given of this passage. Be. says, *Et domus adversus sese dissidens cadit.* This translation is founded on the parallel passages in Mt. and Mr.; for nobody could have so translated the words of L. who had not recurred to the other historians. Now, though this method is often convenient, and sometimes necessary, it should not be used when the words, as they lie, are not obscure, but yield a meaning which is both just and apposite. Besides, the construction observed throughout the whole passage, and even in the parallel places, renders it probable, if not certain, that if the Evangelist's meaning had been the same with Be's. he would have said, *οικος εφ' εαυτον*, which, though elliptical, might possibly, by one who had read no other Gospel, have been

apprehended to convey that sense. In the way it is expressed, it could never have been so understood by any body.

21. *The strong one, ὁ ἰσχυρός.* E. T. *A strong man.* With most interpreters, I had considered this verse as including a comparison to what usually befalls housebreakers. But, on further reflection, observing that the ἰσχυρός is accompanied with the article, both here and in the parallel passages in Mt. and Mr. and that, as to this, there is no diversity of reading in any of the Gospels, I could not help concluding that ὁ ἰσχυρός, like ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἀντιδικός, ὁ διαβόλος, is intended to indicate one individual being. The connexion leads us to apply it to Beelzebub, styled in this passage *the prince of the demons.* Now, in mere similitudes, the thing to which the subject is compared, has no article. Thus Mt. xiii. 45.—*like a merchantman, &c.* 52.—*like a householder, &c.* xxii. 2.—*like a king, &c.* They are expressed indefinitely in Gr. as in Eng. Of our late Eng. interpreters who render ὁ ἰσχυρός properly, are Hey. Wes. and Wy. So also does Wa. in the parallel place in Mt.

22. *He who is stronger, ὁ ἰσχυροτέρος αὐτοῦ.* E. T. *A stronger than he.* As the comparative here, likewise, has the article, nothing in the expression implies that there is more than one stronger; whereas the indefinite Eng. article seems rather to imply it. Yet of the three who had done justice to the emphasis in the former verse, Wes. is the only interpreter who has done it also in this.

29. He said, ἤρξατο λεγείν. Mr. V. 17. N.

36. *By its flame, τῆ ἀστραπῆ.* Such is the import of the Gr. word in this place. It is oftenest applied to *lightning*, but not limited to that meaning.

38. *But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that he used no washing before dinner, ὁ δε φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαυμάσεν, ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτισθῆ προ τοῦ αἰσίου.* Vul. *Pharisæus autem cæpit intra se reputans dicere, quare non baptizatus esset ante prandium.* Agreeably to this version, the Cam. instead of ἰδὼν ἐθαυμάσεν, ὅτι, says, ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λεγείν διότι. But in this it appears to be single.

39. *Malevolence*, *πονηρίας*. Vul. *Iniquitate*. The Sax. to the same purpose. Tertullian adv. Marcion. iv. 27, says *Iniquitate*, probably from the old Itc. This seems to suggest that the interpreter had read *ανομίας*. But I have not heard of any example of this reading in the Gr. MSS.

41. *Only give in alms what ye have*, *πλην τα εινοντα δοτε ελεημοσυνην*. E. T. *But rather give alms of such things as ye have*. *Τα εινοντα, quæ penes aliquem sunt*, what a man is possessed of: *δοτε τα εινοντα* and *δοτε εκ των εινοντων*, are not synonymous. The latter expressly commands to give a part; the former does not expressly command to give the whole, but does not exclude that sense. The words, in the E. T. are an unexceptionable version of the latter. *Τα υπαρχοντα* (ch. xii. 33,) has nearly the same meaning with *τα εινοντα* here. Our Lord, in discoursing on this topic, took a two-fold view of the subject, both tending to the same end. The first and subordinate view was, that the cleanness of the inside of vessels is of as much consequence, at least, as that of the outside; the second and principal view was, that moral cleanness, or purity of mind, is much more important than ceremonial cleanness, resulting from frequent washings. These views are sometimes blended in the discourse. Under the metaphor of vessels, human beings are represented, whereof the body answers to that which is without, the soul to that which is within. Body and soul, argues our Lord, had both the same author, and the one, especially the more ignoble part, ought not to engross our regards, to the neglect of the more noble: and even as to the vessels, the genuine way of cleansing them, in a moral and spiritual sense, is by making them the instruments of conveying relief to the distressed and needy.

44. *Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites*, *γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι, υποκριται*. We have no translation of these words in the Vul. Cop. and Arm. versions. They are wanting also in four MSS. The Cam. has them; as also the Sax version; whence I think it probable that they were in the Itc. version.

47, &c. *Woe unto you, because ye build*—We are not to understand this, as though any part of the guilt lay in building or adorning the tombs of the Prophets, considered in itself; but in their falseness, in giving this testimony of respect to the Prophets, whilst they were actuated by the spirit, and following the exam-

ple of their persecutors and murderers ; insomuch that they appeared to erect those sepulchres, not to do honour to God's Prophets, but to serve as eternal monuments of the success of their progenitors in destroying them.

54. *Laying snares for him, in order to draw*— ενεδρευοντες αυτου και ζητουντες θηρευσαι. E. T. *Laying wait for him, and seeking to catch*— But the copulative και, which makes all the difference in meaning between these two Eng. versions, is wanting in so great a number of MSS. amongst which are those of principal note, in so many editions, versions, &c. that it is justly rejected by Mill, Wet. and other critics.

CHAPTER XII.

5. *Into hell, εις την γεενναν.* Diss. VI. P. II. § 1.

15. *For in whatever affluence a man be, his life dependeth not on his possessions, οτι ουκ εν τω περισσευειν τινι η ζωη αυτου εστιν εκ των υπαρχοντων αυτου.* E. T. *For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.* Vul. *Quia non in abundantia cuiusquam vita ejus est ex his quæ possidet.* Maldonat's observation on this passage is well founded, "Difficiliora sunt verba quam sensus." All interpreters are agreed about the meaning, however much they differ about the construction. The E. T. without keeping close to the words, has expressed the sense rather more obscurely than either the Gr. or the La. The two clauses in the Gr. are in that version, combined into one ; and εστιν εκ seems to be rendered *consisteth in*. The translators of P. R. appears to be the first who have expressed the meaning perspicuously in modern language, *Car en quelque abondance qu'un homme soit, sa vie ne depend point des biens qu'il possede.* In this they have been followed by subsequent interpreters.

25. *Besides, which of you can, by his anxiety, prolong his life one hour ? τις δε εξ υμων μερικων δυναται προσθειναι επι την ηλικιαν αυτου πηχυν ενα.* E. T. *And which of you, with taking thought, can add to his stature one cubit ?* Ηλικια signifies both *stature*, and *age* or *lifetime*. For examples of the latter acceptance, see

Job, ix. 21. 23. Heb. xi. 11. In every case, therefore, the words ought to be rendered by the one or other of these terms which best suits the context. *Πηχυς* is properly a measure of length, and may, on that account, be thought inapplicable to time. But let it be observed, that few tropes are more familiar than those wherein such measures are applied to the age or life of man. *Behold*, says the Psalmist, *thou hast made my days an hand-breadth*, Ps. xxxix. 5. *Ἰδου, παλαιστας εθου τας ἡμερας μου*. The common version says *as an hand-breadth*; but the word *as* is supplied by the interpreters, and has nothing corresponding to it either in the Heb. or in the Gr. Ham. has quoted from Mimnermus, an ancient poet, the phrase *πηχυῖον ἐπι χρονον*, literally *for a cubit of time*, that is, for a very short time. Analogous to this is the common comparison of life to a race, or to a journey. This may suffice to show, that there is no violence done to the words of the Evangelist, in making them relate to a man's age, or term of life, and not to his stature. But whether they actually relate to the one or to the other, is best determined from the context. It is evident, that the warnings which our Lord gives here, and in the parallel passage in Mt. against anxiety, particularly regard the two essential articles of food and raiment, which engross the attention of the much greater part of mankind. Food is necessary for the preservation of life, and raiment for the protection of our bodies from the injuries of the weather. Anxiety about food is, therefore, closely connected with anxiety about life; but, except in children, or very young persons, who must have been an inconsiderable part of Christ's audience, has no connexion with anxiety about stature. Accordingly, it is the preservation of life, and the protection of the body, which our Lord himself points to, as the ultimate aim of all those perplexing cares. *Is not life*, says he, *a greater gift than food, and the body than raiment?* And if so, will not God, who gave the greater gift, life, give also food, which, though a smaller gift, is necessary for supporting the other? In like manner, will not he who gave the body, give the raiment necessary for its defence? All this is entirely consequential, and our Lord, in these warnings, touches what occupies the daily reflections and labour of more than nine-tenths of mankind. But, in what is said about stature, if we understand the word so, he appears to start aside from what employs the time and attention of the people in

every age and country, to what could be an object only to children, and a very few foolish young persons. Besides, the increase of the body, by such an addition to the stature, so far from diminishing men's anxiety, would augment it, by increasing their need both of food and of raiment. In the verse immediately following, we have an additional evidence that the word is employed here metaphorically, and that the discourse still concerns the same subject, food and raiment, or the preservation of life, and the accommodation of the body. *If ye cannot, says he, thus effect, even the smallest thing, ελαχιστον, why are ye anxious about the rest?* In respect of stature, would a cubit be called the smallest thing, which is more than one fourth of the whole? This would have been more suitable, if the word had been *an inch*. In every view, therefore, that we take of the matter, it is extremely improbable that there is here any mention of stature. The idea is foreign to the scope of the discourse; the thing said is ill-suited to the words connected with it, and ill-adapted to the hearers, as it proceeds on the hypothesis, that a sort of solicitude was general among them, which cannot reasonably be supposed to have affected one hundredth part of them. It is a very ingenious, and more than plausible, conjecture of Wet. that ἡλικια, or the ordinary term of life, is here considered under the figure of the *stadium*, or course gone over by the runners, of which, as it consisted of several hundred cubits, a single *cubit* was but as one step, and consequently a very small proportion of the whole, and what might not improperly be termed *ελαχιστον*. It adds to the credibility of this, that the life of man is once and again distinguished in Scripture by the appellation *δρομος*, the course or ground run over by the racers. This is the more remarkable, and shows how much their ears were accustomed to the trope; as it occurs sometimes in places where no formal comparison to the gymnastic exercises, is made, or even hinted. Thus, Acts xiii. 25. *As John fulfilled his course, ὡς ἐπληρου τον δρομον.* xx. 24. *Neither count I my life dear unto myself, says Paul, so that I might finish my course with joy, ὡς τελειωσαι τον δρομον μου.* And 2 Tim. iv. 7. *I have finished my course, το δρομον τετελεκα.* The phrase *ὁ τροχος της γενεσεως*, James iii. 6. has nearly the same signification. The uncommon pains which Herod the great had taken to establish gymnastic exercises in the country, to the great scandal of many, had familiarised the people to

such idioms. Several critics of name favour this interpretation, amongst whom are Ham. Wet. and Pearce. The An. Hey. Wes. and Wa. adopt it. Some other interpreters give it as a probable version in their notes.

31. *Seek ye the kingdom of God, ζητειτε την βασιλειαν του Θεου.* Vul. *Quærite primum regnum, Dei et Justitiam ejus.* There is no countenance from either MSS. or versions worth mentioning in favour of *primum* or of *et justitiam ejus*.

32. *My little flock, το μικρον ποιμνιον.* E. T. *Little flock.* We have here the diminutive *ποιμνιον* combined with the adjective *μικρον*, *little*. It is, therefore, an expression of tenderness, at the same time that it suggests the actual smallness of their number. It has also the article, which we never use in the vocative. In our language we cannot better supply the diminutive and the article, than by the possessive pronoun.

35. The Vul. after *ardentes* adds *in manibus vestris*. This variation is peculiar to that version. The Sax. follows the Gr.

46. *With the faithless, μετα των απιστων.* E. T. *With the unbelievers.* Those are called here *απιστοι* who, in Mt. are called *υποκριται*. Both words have great extent of signification. And for the reason given, in the note on that passage, against rendering *υποκριται* *hypocrites*, *απιστοι* ought not here to be rendered *unbelievers*, but according to the most common acceptation of the word, *the faithless*, that is, persons totally unworthy of trust.

49. *What would I, but that it were kindled? τι θελω, ει ηδη ανηφθη;* E. T. *What will I, if it be already kindled?* Vul. *Quid volo nisi ut accendatur?* Er. Zu. Be. *Quid volo, si jam accensus est?* Cas. *Qui, si jam incensus est, quid volo?* It is evident to me, that the sense is better expressed in the Vul. than by any of the modern La. interpreters. The objection which Be. and after him Palaiet, make, that the *ει* is there translated as if it were *ει μη*, is of no moment, since the *ει* in this verse is, by the acknowledgment of the latter, not the hypothetical conjunction, but a particle expressive of a wish. What Gro. says of this rendering is entirely just, "in eo sensum recte expressit, verba non annumeravit." The very next verse would sufficiently evince the meaning, if there could be a reasonable doubt about it. *I have an immersion to undergo, and how am I pained till it be accomplished?* 'Since the advancement of true religion, which,

is the greatest blessing to mankind, must be attended with such unhappy divisions, I even long till they take place." L. Cl. renders it in the same way with the Vul. *Que souhaitez-vous, sinon qu'il fut déjà enflammé ?* Here the meaning is expressed with simplicity and modesty, as in the original. But I cannot help disrelishing much the manner in which Dod. and after him Wy. have expressed it, though in the general import it does not differ from the last mentioned. *What do I wish ? Oh, that it were already kindled !* This form of venting a wish, is, in a case like the present, when he knew that the event would soon happen, strongly expressive of impatience. I know not any thing whereby interpreters have more injured the native beauty of the style of Scripture, than by the attempts they have sometimes made to express the sense very emphatically.

58. *To satisfy him, ἀπηλλαχθαι ἀπ' αὐτου.* E. T. *That thou mayest be delivered from him.* But a man is delivered from another who makes his escape from him, either by artifice or by force, or who is rescued by another. Now the words *delivered from* suggest some such method of deliverance, rather than that which is here signified by the term *ἀπηλλαχθαι*, a deliverance with consent. To this the parallel place, Mt. v. 25. also evidently points.

CHAPTER XIII.

9. *Perhaps it will bear fruit ; if not, thou mayest afterwards cut it down, εἴαν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπον εἰ δὲ μὴγε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκόψεις αὐτήν.* E. T. *And if it bear fruit, well ; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.* It is plain, that there is an ellipsis in the Gr. ; some word is wanting after *καρπον* to complete the sense. In sentences of the like form, in Gr. writers, when the words wanting are easily supplied by the aid of the context, this figure is not unfrequent : nay, it has sometimes a peculiar energy. As the effect, however, is not the same in modern languages, it is generally thought better to complete the sentence, either by adding the word, or words, wanting, or by making a small alteration on the form of expression. I have preferred the latter of these methods, our translators have followed the former. The difference is not material.

15. *Hypocrites.* E. T. *Thou hypocrite.* In the common Gr. we read *ὑποκριτα*, in the singular number ; but in many MSS. some of principal note, in the Com. and other early editions, in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Eth. Sax. and Ara. versions we find the word in the plural. The very next words, *ἐκαστος ὑμῶν*, show that our Lord's answer was not addressed solely to *the director*, but was intended for all those present who espoused his side of the question. Mill, and several other critics have preferred this reading.

25. *If once the master of the house shall have arisen, ἀφ' οὗ ἀν ἐγεῖρθη ὁ οἰκοδεσποτης.* Vul. *Cum autem intraverit paterfamilias.* In one or two copies we find *εἰσελθῆ* instead of *ἐγεῖρθη*. But this reading of the Vul. though favoured by Cas. and the Sax. translation, has no support of either MSS. or versions to entitle it to regard.

31. *Herod intendeth to kill thee, Ἡρωδης θελει σε αποκτειναι.* E. T. *Herod will kill thee.* But if this last declaration in Eng. were to be turned into Gr. the proper version would be, not what is said by L. but *Ἡρωδης σε αποκτεινει*. The term *will* in Eng. so situated, is a mere sign of the future, and declares no more than that the event will take place. This is not what is declared by the Evangelist. His expression denotes that, at that very time, it was Herod's purpose to kill him ; for the *θελει* here is the principal verb ; the *will* in the translation is no more than an auxiliary. Nay, the two propositions (though, to a superficial view, they appear coincident) are in reality so different, that the one may be true and the other false. Suppose that, instead of Herod, Pilate had been the person spoken of. In that case, to have said in Gr. *Πιλατος θελει σε αποκτειναι*, would have been telling a falsehood ; for the history shows how much his inclination drew the contrary way : whereas, to have said *Πιλατος σε αποκτεινει* would have been affirming no more than the event verified, and might, therefore have been accounted prophetic. Mt. xvi. 24. N. J. vii. 17. N.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Of one of the rulers who was a Pharisee, τινος των αρχων των Φαρισαιων.* E. T. *Of one of the chief Pharisees.* I

agree with Gro. Ham. Wh. Pearce, and others, that *αρχοντες* properly denotes persons in authority, rulers, magistrates; and that any other kind of eminence or superiority would have been distinguished by the term *πρωτοι*, as in ch. xix. 47. Mr. vi. 21. Acts xiii. 50. xvii. 4. xxv. 2. xxviii. 17.

5. *If his ass or his ox, ονος η βους.* Both the Sy. interpreters have read here *υιος, son*, instead of *ονος, ass*, and so have some of the Fathers. The number and value of the MSS. which preserve this reading, are very considerable; and though it is not found in any ancient version except the Sy. yet if we were to be determined solely by the external evidence, I should not hesitate to declare that the balance is in its favour. There is, however, an internal improbability in some things, which very strong outward evidence cannot surmount. The present case is an example; and therefore, though this reading has been admitted by Wet. and some other critics, I cannot help rejecting it, as, upon the whole, exceedingly improbable. My reasons are these: First, Nothing is more common in Scripture style, wherever propriety admits it, than joining in this manner *the ox* and *the ass*, which were in Judea almost the only beasts in common use for work. In the O. T. it occurs very frequently. We find it in the tenth commandment, as recorded in Exod. xx. and both in the fourth and in the tenth, as repeated in Deut. v. When a case like the present is supposed, *of falling into a pit*, Exod. xxi. 33. both are, as usual, specified. *If a man shall dig a pit, and not cover it, and an ox or an ass fall therein—*. That this was also conformable to our Lord's manner, we may see from the preceding chapter, v. 15. *Who is there amongst you that doth not, on the Sabbath, loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?* Secondly, Such a combination, as that of *the ass* and *the ox*, is not more familiar and more natural, than the other, of a man's *son* and his *ox*, is unnatural and unprecedented. Things thus familiarly coupled in discourse, are commonly things homogeneal, or of natures, at least, not very dissimilar. Such are, *the son and the daughter, the man-servant and the maid-servant, the ox and the ass.* Thirdly, In those specimens which our Lord has given of confuting the Pharisees, by retorting on them their own practice, the argument is always of that kind which logicians call *à fortiori*. This cir-

cumstance is sometimes taken notice of in the application of the argument, and even when it is not expressly pointed out, it is plain enough from the sense. See ch. xiii. 15, 16. xv. 2, 3, 4. 8, 9. Mt. xii. 11, 12. But if the word here be *son*, this method is reversed, and the argument loses all its energy. A man, possessed of even the Pharisaical notions concerning the Sabbath, might think it, in the case supposed, excusable from natural affection, or even justifiable from paternal duty, to give the necessary aid to a child in danger of perishing, and, at the same time, think it inexcusable to transgress the commandment for one to whom he is under no such obligations. Fourthly, When the nature of the thing, and the scope of the place render it credible that a particular reading is erroneous, the facility of falling into such an error adds greatly to the credibility. Now *ύιος* and *ονος*, in writing, have so much resemblance, that we cannot wonder that a hasty transcriber should have mistaken one for the other. If the mistake has been very early, the number of copies now affected by it would be the greater. It is too mechanical a mode of criticising, to be determined by outward circumstances alone, and to pay no regard to those internal probabilities, of which every one who reflects must feel the importance.

15. *Who shall feast, ός φαγεται αρτον.* E. T. *Who shall eat bread.* To eat bread is a well-known Heb. idiom for to share in a repast, whether it be at a common meal, or at a sumptuous feast. The word *bread* is not understood as suggesting either the scantiness or the meanness of the fare.

² *In the reign, εν τη βασιλεια.* E. T. *In the kingdom.* The E. T. makes, to appearance, the word *βασιλεια* here, refer solely to the future state of the saints in heaven. This version makes it relate to those who should be upon the earth in the reign of the Messiah. My reasons for preferring the latter are these: 1st, This way of speaking of the happiness of the Messiah's administration, suits entirely the hopes and wishes which seem to have been long entertained by the nation concerning it. (See ch. x. 23, 24. Mt. xiii. 10, 11.) 2dly, The parable which, in answer to the remark, was spoken by our Lord, is, on all hands, understood to represent the Christian dispensation. 3dly, The obvious intention of that parable is to insinuate that, in consequence of the prejudices which, from notions of secular felicity and grandeur, the nation, in general, entertained, on

that subject; what, in prospect, they fancied so blessed a period, would, when present, be exceedingly neglected and despised; and, in this view, nothing could be more apposite; whereas, there appears no appositeness in the parable on the other interpretation.

23. *Compel people to come, αναγκασον ειδελθειν.* Ch. xxiv.
29. N.

26. *Hate not his father, ου μισει τον πατερα εαντου.* It is very plain, that *hating*, used in this manner, was among the Hebrews an idiomatic expression for *loving less*. It is the same sentiment, which in Mt.'s Gospel, x. 37. is conveyed in these words, *He who loveth father or mother more than me*— In the strict acceptation of the term, the doctrine of Christ does not permit us to hate any one, not even an enemy, much less a parent, to whom it exacts a more substantial honour than the traditional system of the scribes represented as necessary. The things here enumerated, particularly what finishes the list, of which I am to speak immediately, show evidently that the language is figurative.

² *Nay, and himself too, ετι δε και την εαντου ψυχην.* E. T. *Yea, and his own life also.* Vul. *Adhuc etiam et animam suam.* Cas. *Atque adeo suam ipsius animam*, which he explains on the margin, *semetipsum*. Dio. renders it *anzi anchora se stesso*. The reasons for which I have preferred this last manner are the following: First, *ψυχη* is generally used in the Hellenistic idiom as corresponding to the Heb. נֶפֶשׁ *nephesh*, *soul* or *life*. Now it is well known, that this word, with the affix, is frequently used in Heb. for the reciprocal pronoun. Thus נֶפֶשִׁי *naphshi*, commonly rendered in the Sep. ἡ ψυχη μου, is *myself*, נֶפֶשֶׁךָ *naphshecha*, ἡ ψυχη σου, *thyself*, and so of the rest. See Lev. xi. 43. Esth. iv. 13. Ps. cxxxi. 2. Now as there runs through the whole of this verse in L. an implicit comparison; to preserve an uniformity in the manner of naming the particulars, shows better the preference which our Lord claims in our hearts, not only to our nearest relatives, but also to ourselves. Secondly, I have avoided the phrase *hating his life*, as ambiguous, and often used, not improperly, of those who destroy themselves. Now the disposition which our Lord here requires of his disciples, is exceedingly different from that of those persons. For the like reason I have not said *hate his own soul*, though what many

would account the most literal version of them all. For this expression is also used sometimes (see Prov. xxix. 24.) in a sense quite different from the present. Thirdly, I prefer here this strong manner of exhibiting the sentiment, as, in such cases, whatever shows most clearly that the words cannot be literally understood, serves most effectually to suggest the figurative and true interpretation. Now as, in the common acceptation, to hate one's parents would be impious, the Apostle Paul tells us, Eph. v. 29. that to hate one's self is impossible. It is not in this acceptation then that we can look for the meaning.

CHAPTER XV.

1. The Vul. the Sy. and the Sax. have no word answering to *all* in this sentence.

16. *He was fain*, επεθυμει. Ch. xvi. 21. N.

² *With the husks*, απο των κεραιων. Vul. *De siliquis*. That κεραιον answers to *siliqua*, and signifies a *husk*, or pod, wherein the seeds of some plants, especially those of the leguminous tribe, are contained, is evident. But both the Gr. κεραιον and the La. *siliqua* signify also the fruit of the carob-tree, a tree very common in the Levant, and in the southern parts of Europe, as Spain and Italy. The Sy. and Ara. words are of the same import. This fruit still continues to be used for the same purpose, the feeding of swine. It is also called *St. John's bread*, from the opinion that the Baptist used it in the wilderness. It is the pod only that is eaten, which shows the propriety of the names κεραιον and *siliqua*, and of rendering it into Eng. *husk*. Miller says, it is mealy, and has a sweetish taste, and that it is eaten by the poorer sort, for it grows in the common hedges, and is of little account.

18. *Against heaven*, that is, *against God*. Diss. V. P. I. § 4.

22. *Bring hither the principal robe*, εξενεργατε την στολην την πρωτην. Vul. *Cito proferte stolam primam*. Ταχως is found in the Cam. and one other MS. of small note. The second Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions have also read so.

30. *Thy living*, σου τον βιον. Vul. *Substantiam suam*. The

reading of the Vul. has no support from ancient versions or Gr. MSS. unless we reckon the Cam. which reads *παντα* without any pronoun.

CHAPTER XVI.

8. *Commended the prudence of the unjust steward*, *επηνεδε τον οικονομον της αδικαιμωσ, οτε φρωτιμωσ εποησεν*. E. T. *Commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely*. When an active verb has for its subject a quality, disposition, or action, of a person, it is a common Heb. idiom to mention the person, as that which is directly affected by the verb, and to introduce the other (as we see done here) by a conjunction,—*commended the unjust steward, because he had acted prudently*, that is, *commended the prudence which he had shown in his action*. Properly his master commended neither the actor nor the action, but solely the provident care about his future interest, which the action displayed; *a care worthy the imitation of those who have in view a nobler futurity, eternal life*.

² *Τον οικονομον της αδικιασ for τον αδικον*, in like manner as *ο κπιτης της αδικιασ*, ch. xviii. 6. for *ο αδικωσ, the unjust judge*.

³ *In conducting their affairs, εις την γενεαν την εαντων*. E. T. *In their generation*. *Γενεα* is the word by which the Seventy commonly render the Heb. דור *dor*, which signifies not only age, *seculum*, and generation, or the people of the age, but also a man's manner of life. Thus Noah is said, Gen. vi. 9. to be *τελειωσ εν τη γενεα αυτου*. Houbigant renders it *integer in viis suis*. It is true he conjectures very unnecessarily a different reading. Yet he himself, in another place, admits this as one meaning of the Heb. word דור *dor*. Thus Is. liii. 8. the words rendered in the Sep. *την γενεαν αυτου τις διηγησεται*, he translates *ejus omnem vitam quis secum reputabit*,² and in the notes defends this translation of the Heb. דור *dor*. To the same purpose bishop Lowth, in his late version of that prophet, *His manner of life who would declare*?

9 *With the deceitful mammon, εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιασ*. E. T. *Of the mammon of unrighteousness*. Here again the substantive is employed by the same Hebraism, as in the preceding verse, to supply the place of the adjective, *μαμωνα της αδικιασ*, as *οικονο-*

μον της αδικιας. The epithet *unrighteous*, here applied to man-
mon or riches, does not imply acquired by injustice or any undue
means ; but, in this application, it denotes *false riches*, that is, *de-*
ceitful, not to be relied on. What puts this beyond a question is,
that, in v. 11. το αδικω μαμωνα is contrasted, not by το δικαιον, but
by το αληθινον, the former relating to *earthly* treasure, the latter to
heavenly. For the import of mammon, see Mt. vi. 24. N.

² *After your discharge, όταν εκλιπητε.* E. T. *When ye fail.*
As this is spoken in the application of the parable, it is to be under-
stood as referring to that circumstance which must sooner or later hap-
pen to all, and which bears some analogy to the steward's dismissal
from his office. This circumstance is *death*, by which we are total-
ly discharged from our employment and probation here. The word
fail, in the common version, is obscure and indefinite. I have pre-
ferred *discharge*, as both adapted to the expression of the Evange-
list, and sufficiently explicit. It bears a manifest reference to the act
whereby a trustee is divested of his trust, and is also strictly applica-
ble to our removal out of this world. Cas. has happily preserved
this double allusion in La. by saying, *Quum defuncti fueritis.* L.
Cl. has not been so fortunate in Fr. ; he says, *Quand vous serez*
expirez. The verb here shows clearly the future event pointed to,
but detaches it altogether from the story ; for the word *expirez* can-
not be applied to the discarding of a steward from office. Of so
much use in interpreting do we sometimes find words which are, in
a certain degree, equivocal.

³ *Into the eternal mansions, εις τας αιωνιους οικιας.* E. T. *Into*
everlasting habitations. As οικια properly signifies a *tent* or *tab-*
ernacle, which is a temporary and moveable habitation, some have
thought it not so fitly joined with the epithet αιωνιος. It is true that
in strictness, οικια means no more than a *tent* ; but it is also true,
that sometimes it is used with greater latitude, for a *dwelling* of any
kind, without regard either to its nature or its duration. The article
has been very improperly, in this passage, overlooked by our trans-
lators. It adds to the precision, and consequently to the perspicui-
ty, of the application. J. i. 14. ² N.

16. *Every occupant entereth it by force, πας εις αυτην βιαζεται.*
E. T. *Every man presseth into it.* Though this last interpre-
tation may be accounted more literal than that here given, it is

farther from the import of the sentence. The intention is manifestly to inform us, not how great the number was of those who entered into the kingdom of God, but what the manner was in which all who entered obtained admission. The import, therefore, is only, *Every one who entereth it, entereth it by force.* We know, that during our Lord's ministry, which was, (as John's also was) among the Jews; both his success and that of the Baptist were comparatively small. Christ's flock was literally, even to the last, ποιμνιον μικρον, *a very little flock.* Of the backwardness of the people, we hear frequently in the Gospel. *He came to his own, says the Apostle John, but his own received him not.* And he himself complains, *Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life.* It was not till after he was lifted up upon the cross, that, according to his own prediction, he drew all men to him.

20. *A poor man, πτωχος τις.* E. T. *A certain beggar.* Though either way of rendering is good, the first is more conformable to the extensive application of the Gr. word, than the second. *To beg* is always in the N. T. απαιτειν or προσαιτειν. The present participle προσαιτων, agreeably to a well known Heb. idiom, strictly denotes *a beggar.*

21. *Was fain to feed on the crumbs, επιθυμων χορτασθηναι απο των ψιχων.* E. T. *Desiring to be fed with the crumbs.* I agree with those who do not think there is any foundation, in this expression, for saying that he was refused the crumbs. First, the word επιθυμων does not imply so much; secondly, the other circumstances of the story render this notion improbable. First, as to the scriptural sense of the word, the verb επιθυμew is used by the Seventy, Is. i. 29. for rendering the Heb. באר bahar, *elegit.* The clause is rendered, in the E. T. *For the gardens which ye have chosen.* In like manner, in Is. lviii. 2. the word occurs twice, answering to the Heb. פעח chaphats, *to delight, or take pleasure in;* γνωμαι μου τας οδους, επιθυμουσιν; again, εγγιζειν Θεω επιθυμουσιν. E. T. *They delight to know my ways; and, They take delight in approaching to God.* It is not necessary to multiply examples. That the notion, that he did not obtain the crumbs, is not consistent with the other circumstances, is evident. When the historian says, that he was laid at the rich man's gate, he means not, surely, that he was once there, but that he was

usually so placed, which would not probably have happened, if he had got nothing at all. The other circumstances concur in heightening the probability. Such are, the rich man's immediately knowing him, his asking that he might be made the instrument of the relief wanted; and, let me add this, that though the Patriarch upbraids the rich man with the carelessness and luxury in which he had lived, he says not a word of inhumanity; yet, if we consider Lazarus as having experienced it so recently, it could hardly, on this occasion, have failed to be taken notice of. Can we suppose that Abraham, in the charge he brought against him, would have mentioned only the things of least moment, and omitted those of the greatest? For similar reasons, I have rendered *επεθυμει*, ch. xv. 16. in the same manner as here. In the E. T. the expression there suggests more strongly, that his desire was frustrated: *He would fain have filled his belly*, which, in the common idiom, always implies, *but could not*. It appears very absurd, that one should have the charge of keeping swine, who had it not in his power to partake with them. How could it be prevented? Would the master multiply his servants in time of famine, and send one to watch and keep this keeper? The clause, *for nobody gave him ought*, is to be interpreted not strictly, but agreeably to popular language; as though it had been said that in the general calamity he was much neglected, and if he had not had recourse to the food allotted for the swine, he would have been in imminent danger of starving.

² Much injury has been done to our Saviour's instructions, by the ill-judged endeavours of some expositors to improve and strengthen them. I know no better example for illustrating this remark, than the story of the rich man and Lazarus. Many, dissatisfied with its simplicity, as related by the Evangelist, and desirous, one would think, to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of excessive severity in the condemnation of the former, load that wretched man with all the crimes which blacken human nature, and for which they have no authority from the words of inspiration. They will have him to have been a glutton and a drunkard, rapacious and unjust, cruel and hard-hearted, one who spent in intemperance what he had acquired by extortion and fraud. Now, I must be allowed to remark that, by so doing, they totally pervert the de-

sign of this most instructive lesson, which is to admonish us, not that a monster of wickedness, who has, as it were, devoted his life to the service of Satan, shall be punished in the other world; but that the man who, though not chargeable with doing much ill, does little or no good, and lives, though not, perhaps, an intemperate, a sensual, life; who, careless about the situation of others, exists only for the gratification of himself, the indulgence of his own appetites, and his own vanity; shall not escape punishment. It is to show the danger of living in the neglect of duties, though not chargeable with the commission of crimes; and, particularly the danger of considering the gifts of Providence as our own property, and not as a trust from our Creator, to be employed in his service, and for which we are accountable to him. These appear to be the reasons for which our Lord has here shown the evil of a life which, so far from being universally detested, is, at this day, but too much admired, envied, and imitated.

³ The Vul. adds, *Et nemo illi dabat*; but has no support, except that of one or two inconsiderable MSS. and the Sax. version. This reading has, doubtless, by the blunder of some copyist, been transcribed from the preceding chapter.

22. Vul. *Sepultus est in inferno*. This reading is equally unsupported with the former, and is a mere corruption of the text, arising from the omission of the conjunction in the beginning of verse 23. and the misplacing of the points.

For the illustration of several words in this and the following verses, such as *εν τω αδη—τον κολπον του Αβρααμ—απενεχθηναι—διαβηναι—διαπερωσιν*—see Prel. Diss. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.

25. A great many MSS. and some ancient versions, particularly the Sy. read *ωδε*, *here*, instead of *οδε*, *but he*; and this reading is adopted by Wet. The resemblance in sound, as well as in writing, may easily account for a much greater mistake in copying. But that the common reading is preferable, can hardly be questioned. In it *ο δε* is contrasted to *συ δε*, as *υυ* is, in like manner, to *εν ζωη σου*; but to *ωδε* nothing is opposed. Had *εκει* occurred in the other member of the comparison made by the Patriarch, I should have readily admitted that the probability was on the side of the Sy. version.

CHAPTER XVII.

1. *To his disciples, προς τους μαθητας.* Vul. *Ad discipulos suos.* This reading is favoured by the Al. Cam. and a considerable number of MSS. and by the 1st Sy. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. The 2d Sy. also has the pronoun, but it is marked as doubtful with an asterisk. The sense is nowise affected.

7. *Would any of you who hath a servant, &c. say to him, on his return from the field, Come immediately, τις δε εξ υμων δουλον εχων —ειδελθοντι εκ του αγρου ερει ευθεως παρελθων.* E. T. *Which of you having a servant—, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field, Go—* Vul. *Quis vestrum habens servum—* *Regresso de agro dicat illi, statim transi.* The only material difference between these two versions arises from the different manner of pointing. I have, with the Vul. joined *ευθεως* to *παρελθων*. Our translators have joined it to *ερει*. In this way of reading the sentence, the adverb is no better than an expletive; in the other, *ευθεως πα ελθων* is well contrasted to *μετα ταυτα φαγεσαι* in the following verse.

10. *We have conferred no favour, δουλοι αχρειοι εβμεν.* Diss. 7. XII. P. I. § 14.

11. *Through the confines of Samaria and Galilee, δια μεσου Σαμαρειας και Γαλιλαιας.* E. T. *Through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.* I agree with Gro. and others, that it was not through the heart of these countries, but on the contrary, through those parts in which they bordered with each other, that our Lord travelled at that time. I understand the words *δια μεσου*, as of the same import with *ανα μεσου*, as commonly understood. And in this manner we find it interpreted by the Sy. and Ara. translators. No doubt the nearest way, from where our Lord resided, was through the midst of Samaria. But had that been his route, the historian had no occasion to mention Galilee, the country whence he came; and if he had mentioned it, it would have been surely more proper, in speaking of a journey from a Galilean city to Jerusalem, to say, through Galilee and Samaria, than, reversing the natural order, to say, through Samaria and Galilee. But if, as I understand it, the confines only of the two countries were meant, it is a matter of no consequence which of them was first named. Besides, the incident recorded in

the following words, also renders it more probable that he was on the borders of Samaria, than in the midst of the country. It appears that there was but one Samaritan among the lepers that were cleansed, who is called an alien, the rest being Jews.

18. *This alien*, ὁ ἀλλογενής οὗτος. The Jews have, ever since the captivity, considered the Samaritans as aliens. They call them *Cuthites* to this day.

21. *The reign of God is within you*, ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν. Vul. Er. Lu. *Regnum Dei intra vos est.* Cas. though not in the same words, to the same purpose. I should have added Be. too, who says, *Regnum Dei intus habetis*; had he not shown, in his Commentary, that he meant differently, denoting no more, by *intus*, than *apud vos*. Most modern translators, and, among them, the authors of our common version, have rendered the words in the same way as the Vul. the Sy. and other ancient interpreters. L. Cl. and Beau. both, say, *Au milieu de vous*, and have been followed by some Eng. translators, particularly the An. and Dod. who say, *Among you*. This way of rendering has also been strenuously supported, of late, by some learned critics. I shall briefly state the evidence on both sides. That the preposition ἐντός, before a plural noun, signifies *among*, Raphelius has given one clear example from Xenophon's Expedition of Cyrus, the only one, it would appear, that has yet been discovered, for to it later critics, as Dod. and Pearce, have been obliged to recur. I have taken occasion, once and again, to declare my dissatisfaction with conclusions founded merely on classical authority, in cases where recourse could be had to the writings of the N. T. or the ancient Gr. translation of the Old. I acknowledge that ἐντός does not oft occur in either, but it does sometimes. Yet in none of the places does it admit the signification which those critics give it here. As I would avoid being tedious, I shall only point out the passages to the learned reader, leaving him to consult them at his leisure. The only other place in the N. T. is Mt. xxiii. 26. In the Sep. Ps. xxxviii. 4. cviii. 22. or, as numbered in the Eng. Bible, xxxix 3. cix. 22. and Cant. iii. 10. These are all the passages wherein ἐντός occurs as a preposition in that version. But it is sometimes used elliptically with the article τα, for the inside, or the things within, as Ps. cii. 1. in the Gr. but in the Eng. ciii. 1. Js. xvi. 11. Dan. x. 16. We have this

expression also twice in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xix. 26. 1 Mac. iv. 48. Of all which I shall only remark, in general, that no advocate for the modern interpretation of *εντος υμων* in the Gospel, has produced any one of them as giving countenance to his opinion. Wh. (who, though a judicious critic, sometimes argues more like a party than a judge,) after explaining *εντος υμων εστιν* to mean, *is even now among you*, and, *is come unto you*; adds, “so *εντος, υμων*, and *εν υμιν*, are frequently used in the O. T.” Now, the truth is, that *εν υμιν*, does frequently occur in the O. T. in the acceptance mentioned, but *εντος υμων* never, either in that or in any other acceptance: nor does *εντος ημων* occur, nor *εντος αυτων*, nor any similar expression. The author proceeds to give examples: accordingly, his examples are all (as was unavoidable, for he had no other) of *εν υμιν*, and *εν ημιν*, not one of *εντος υμων*, or of any similar application of this preposition. Strange, indeed, if he did not perceive that a single example of this use of the preposition, *εντος* (which use he had affirmed to be frequent,) was more to his purpose than five hundred examples of the other. The instances of the other were, indeed, nothing to his purpose at all. The import of *εν*, in such cases, was never questioned; and his proceeding on the supposition that those phrases were equivalent, was what logicians call a *petitio principii*, a taking for granted the whole matter in dispute. Nay, let me add, the frequency of the occurrence of *εν υμιν*, in Scripture, applied to a purpose to which *εντος υμων* is never applied, notwithstanding the numerous occasions, makes against his argument, instead of supporting it, as it renders it very improbable that the two phrases were understood as equivalent.—But to come from the external, to the internal, evidence; it has been thought, that the interpretation, *amongst you*, suits better the circumstances of the times. The Messiah was already come. His doctrine was begun to be preached, and converts, though not very numerous, were made. This may be regarded as evidences that his reign was already commenced among them. But in what sense, it may be asked, could his reign or kingdom be said to be within them? It is true, that the laws of this kingdom were intended for regulating the inward principles of the heart, as well as outward actions of the life; but is it not rather too great a stretch in language, to talk of God’s kingdom being within us? So, I acknowledge, I thought

once ; but on considering the great latitude wherein the phrase, ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου, is used in the N. T. in relation sometimes to the epoch of the dispensation, sometimes to the place, sometimes for the divine administration itself, sometimes for the laws and maxims which would obtain ; I began to think differently of the use of the word in this passage. The Apostle Paul hath said, Rom. xiv. 17. *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.* Now, these qualities, *righteousness, and peace, and spiritual joy*, if we have them at all, must be *within us*, that is, in the heart or soul. If so, the Apostle has, by implication, said no less than is reported here by the Evangelist, as having been said by our Lord, that the kingdom of God is *within us*. Is there any impropriety in saying that God reigns in the hearts of his people ? If not, to say, *the reign of God is in their hearts*, or *within them*, is the same thing, a little varied in the form of expression. Even the rendering of βασιλεια, *kingdom*, and not *reign*, heightens the apparent impropriety. But it is a more formidable objection against the common version, that our Lord's discourse was at that time addressed to the Pharisees : and how could it be said to men, whose hearts were so alienated from God, as theirs then were, that God reigned within them ? This difficulty seems to have determined the opinion of Dr. Dod. To this I answer, that in such declarations, conveying general truths, the personal pronoun is not to be strictly interpreted. It is not, in such cases *you* the individuals spoken to, but *you* of this nation, or *you* of the human species, men in general. In this way we understand the words of Moses, Deut. xxx. 11, 12, 13, 14. *This commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto to us, that we may hear it, and do it ? Nor is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it ? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.* This is not to be considered as characterising any individual (for let it be observed, that the pronoun is, throughout the whole, in the singular number,) nor even the whole people addressed. The people addressed had, by their conduct, shown too often, and too plainly, that the

commandments of God were neither in their heart, nor in their mouth. But it is to be considered as explaining the nature of the divine service; for it remains an unchangeable truth, that it is an essential character of the service which God requires from his people, that his word be habitually in their heart. The same sentiment is quoted by the Apostle, Rom. x. 6, &c. and adapted to the Gospel dispensation. I think further with Markland, that *εντος υμων*, as implying an inward and spiritual principle, is here opposed to *παρατηρησις*, outward show and parade, with which secular dominion is commonly introduced.

36. The whole of this verse is wanting in many MSS. some of them of great note. It is not found in some of the early editions, nor in the Cop. and Eth. versions. But both the Sy. versions, also the Ara. and the Vul. have it. In a number of La. MSS. it is wanting. Some critics suppose it to have been added from Mt. This is not improbable. However, as the evidence on both sides nearly balances each other, I have retained it in the text, distinguishing it as of doubtful authority.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. *He also showed them by a parable that they ought to persist in prayer, ελεγε δε και παραβολην, αυτοις προς το δειν παντοτε προσευχεσθαι. E. T. And he spake a parable unto them, to to this end, that men ought always to pray.* The construction here plainly shows, that the word to be supplied before the infinitive is *αυτους*. *Ελεγεν αυτοις—προς το δειν αυτοις*. The words are a continuation of the discourse related in the preceding chapter, which is here rather inopportunately interrupted by the division into chapters. There is, in these words, and in the following parable, a particular reference to the distress and trouble they were soon to meet with from their persecutors, which would render the duties of prayer, patience, and perseverance, peculiarly seasonable.

2. *Without growing weary, και μη εκκακειν. E. T. and not to faint.* At the time when the common version was made, the Eng.

verb *to faint* was here of the same import with the expression I have used. But, as in that acceptation it is now become obsolete, perspicuity requires a change.

3. *Do me justice on my adversary, εκδικησον με απο του αντιδικου μου.* E. T. *Avenge me of mine adversary.* The Eng. verb *to avenge*, denotes either *to revenge* or *to punish*; the last especially, when God is spoken of as the avenger. The Gr. verb *εκδικεω* signifies also to *judge a cause*, and to defend the injured judicially from the injurious person. The word *avenge*, therefore, does not exactly hit the sense of the original in v. 3. although in the application of the parable, v. 7. it answers better than any other term. The literal sense is so manifest, and the connexion in the things spoken of is so close, that the change of the word in translating does not hurt perspicuity.

7. *Will he linger in their cause? και μακροθυμων επ' αυτοις.* E. T. *Though he bear long with them.* Vul. *Et patientiam habebit in illis?* Er. *Etiam cum patiens fuerit super illis.* Lu. *Etiam si longa patientia utatur super illis.* Cas. *Et tam erit in eos difficilis?* Be. *Etiam si iram differat super ipsis.* So various are the ways of interpreting this short clause. Let it be observed that both the Al. and the Cam. MSS. read *μακροθυμει.* The Vul. and even the Sy. appear to me to have read in the same manner; so also have some of the Fathers. But the version given here does not depend on that reading. The omission of the substantive verb, connected with the participle, is common in the Oriental idiom. I therefore understand *μακροθυμων* here as put for *μακροθυμων εσται*, and consequently equivalent to *μακροθυμει.* As *μακροθυμειν* commonly denotes to have patience, and as it sometimes happens that patient people appear slow in their proceedings, it comes, by an easy transition, to signify *to linger, to delay.* In this sense I understand it here with Gro. reading this member of the sentence, as well as the preceding, with an interrogation. The words quoted by him from the Son of Sirach, Eccus. xxxii. 18. in the Gr. but in the E. T. which follows the Com. and the Vul. xxxv. 18. appear both perspicuous and decisive, 'Ο κυριος ου μη βραδυνη, ουδε μη μακροθυμησει επ' αυτοις. The first clause is justly interpreted in the E. T. *the Lord will not be slack*; but the second is rendered, both obscurely and in-

accurately, *neither will the mighty be patient towards them*. Properly thus, *neither will he linger in their cause*. The pronoun *their* refers to *the humble* mentioned in the preceding verse, whose prayer pierceth the clouds. To me it appears very probable, considering the affinity of the subject, that the Evangelist had, in the expression he employed, an allusion to the words of the Jewish sage.

9. *Will he find this belief in the land?* ἀρα ἐνρηθει την πιστιν επι της γης; E. T. *Shall he find faith on the earth?* There is a close connexion in all that our Lord says on any topic of conversation, which rarely escapes an attentive reader. If, in this, as is very probable, he refers to the destruction impending over the Jewish nation, as the judgment of heaven for their rebellion against God, in rejecting and murdering the Messiah, and in persecuting his adherents, *την πιστιν* must be understood to mean *this belief*, or the belief of the particular truth he had been inculcating, namely, that God will, in due time, avenge his elect, and signally punish their oppressors; and *την γην* must mean *the land*, to wit, Judea. The words may be translated either way; but the latter evidently gives them a more definite meaning, and unites them more closely with those which preceded.

9. *Example, παραβολην.* Mt. xiii. 3. N.

11. *The Pharisee, standing by himself, prayed thus,* ὁ Φαρισαίος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν πάντα προσηύχετο. E. T. *The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself.* Our translators have considered the words *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν* as connected with *προσηύχετο*, in which case they are a mere pleonasm. I have preferred the manner of Dod. and others, who join them to *σταθεὶς*; for in this way they are characteristic of the sect, who always affected to dread pollution from the touch of those whom they considered as their inferiors in piety.

13. *At a distance, μακροθεν.* Mt. viii. 30.

14. *Than the other, η κεινος.* There is a considerable diversity of reading on this clause. A few copies have *παρ' ἐκεινον*, a great number *η γαρ κεινος*, and others still differently. But the meaning is the same in all.

25. *Pass through, εισελθειν.* Vul. *Transire.* I have here, with the Eng. translators, preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The MSS. however, are not unanimous. The Al. Cam. and a few others, read *διελθειν.* Agreeable to this is the version, not only of the Vul. but of the Go. Sax. second Sy. and Eth. Mt. xix. 24. N.

31. *All that the prophets have written shall be accomplished on the son of man.* *Τελεσθησεται παντα τα γεγραμμενα δια των προφητων, τω υιω του ανθρωπου.* E. T. *All things that are written by the prophets, concerning the son of man, shall be accomplished,* which is literally from the Vul. *Consummabuntur omnia quæ scripta sunt per prophetas de filio hominis.* This version must have arisen from a different reading. Accordingly the Cam. and two or three MSS. of no account, for *τω υιω* read *περι του υιου.* Agreeable to this also is the rendering of both the Sy. and the reading of some early editions. But this is not a sufficient reason for rejecting the common reading, especially when the sense conveyed by it, is equally good. Yet it has been deserted by most modern interpreters. Castalio has indeed adopted it. *Filio hominis accident planè omnia quæ sunt a vaticibus scripta.* With this also agree the G. E. and Wes. Add to these Wa. in his *New Translations* lately published.

35. *When he came near Jericho, εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις Ιεριχω.* L. Cl. and Beau. *Comme il etoit près de Jerico.* This manner is likewise adopted by most of the late Eng. translators. What recommends it is the consideration that thereby an apparent contradiction in the Evangelists is avoided; Mt. and Mr. having mentioned this miracle, as performed by our Lord, after he left Jericho. Gro. has remarked, that *εγγιζειν* means *to² be near,* as well as *to come near,* which is true. But it is not less true, that in this acceptation, it is construed with the dative. When followed by the preposition *εις,* it always denotes, if I mistake not, to approach. A most extraordinary solution is given from Markland [Bowyer's conjectures,] who supposes an ellipsis, which he supplies thus, *εν τω εγγιζειν αυτον εις [supple 'Ιεροσολυμα εις] Ιεριχω.* If so, the translation here given is unexceptionable; for the ellipsis is just as easily supplied in Eng. as in Gr. *When they came near [meaning Jerusalem, being at] Jericho.* A liberty so unbounded is not more agreeable to the Gr. idiom than

to the Eng. It is alike repugnant to the idiom of every tongue, to authorise an interpreter to make a writer say what he pleases. Such licences are subversive of all grammar and syntax.

CHAPTER XIX.

2. *And chief of the publicans, και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης.* E. T. *Which was the chief among the publicans.* This seems to imply, that he was the chief of the whole order in Palestine. Had this been the case, the name would have, most probably, been attended with the article. Thus it is always said *ὁ αρχιεργς* when *the high priest* is spoken of. In like manner, when there is in the nation but one of any particular office or dignity, as *ὁ βασιλευς*, *the king*, *ὁ ηγεμων*, *the procurator*, *ὁ ανθυπατος*, *the proconsul*. To have translated the word *a chief publican*, would have been, on the contrary, saying too little. This expression does not necessarily imply authority, or even that there were not, in the same place, some on a footing with him. Now, if the Evangelist had meant to say no more than this, I think his expression would have been *εις των αρχιτελωνων*, as we find, in the same way, *εις των αρχισυναγωγων* used, Mr. v. 22. Whereas, the manner in which L. mentions the circumstance of office here, *και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης*, seems to show that, in the station he possessed, he was single in that place, and consequently that he was chief of the publicans of the city or district; for let it be observed that, though the Gr. article renders the noun to which it is prefixed perfectly definite, the want of it does not render a noun so decisively indefinite, as the indefinite article does in modern languages.

8. *If in aught I have wronged any man, ει τινος εδουκοφαντησα.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 16.

9. *Jesus said concerning him, ειπε προς αυτον ὁ Ιησους,* E. T. *Jesus said unto him.* The thing said shows clearly, that our Lord spoke, not to Zaccheus, but to the people concerning Zaccheus. He is mentioned in the third person, *καθοτι και αυτος*, *inasmuch as he also*. Of this mode of expression we have another example in the

very next chapter, v. 19. *εγνωσαν οτι προς αυτους την παραβολην ταυτην ειπε.* E. T. *They perceived that he had spoken this parable against them.* It is from the import of the parable itself that *προς αυτους* is rendered *against them*; for, had it been in their favour, there would have been no impropriety in saying *προς αυτους* to denote *concerning them*, or in relation to them. Another example we have, Heb. i. 7. *προς μεν τους αγγελους λεγει.* E. T. *Of the angels he saith.*

12. *To procure for himself the royalty, λαβειν εαντω βασιλειαν.* E. T. *To receive for himself a kingdom.* To me it is manifest that *βασιλεια* here signifies *royalty*, that is, royal power and dignity. For that it was not a different kingdom from that wherein he lived, as the common version implies, is evident from v. 14. It is equally so, that there is in this circumstance an allusion to what was well known to his hearers, the way in which Archelaus, and even Herod himself, had obtained their rank and authority in Judea, by favour of the Romans. When this reference to the history of the times is kept in view, and *βασιλεια* understood to denote *royal power* and dignity, there is not the shadow of a difficulty in the story. In any other explanation, the expounder, in order to remove inconsistencies, is obliged to suppose so many circumstances not related, or even hinted, by the Evangelist, that the latter is, to say the least, made appear a very inaccurate narrator. The great latitude in which the word *βασιλεια* is used in the Gospel, will appear from several considerations, particularly from its being employed in ushering in a great number of our Lord's parables, wherein the subjects illustrated are very different from one another. Diss. V. P. I. § 7.

13. *Having called ten of his servants, καλεσας δε δεκα δουλους εαντου.* E. T. *He called his ten servants.* This implies that he had neither more nor fewer than *ten servants*, who were all called. Had this been our Lord's meaning, the expression must have been *καλεσας δε τους δεκα δουλους εαντου.* Thus Mt. x. 1. *προσκαλεσαμενος τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου.* *Having called to him his twelve disciples.* So also Mt. xi. 1. L. ix. 1. The article is never wanting while the number is complete.

^a *Pounds.* Diss. VIII. P. I. § 7.

22. *Malignant, πονηρε.* Mt. xxv. 26.

26. *To every one who hath, more shall be given, Παντι τω εχοντι δοθησεται.* Vul. *Omni habenti dabitur, et abundabit.* For the two last words the La. has the sanction of five MSS. of no name, which read *και περισσευθησεται*, but of no version whatever.

32. *Found every thing as he had told them, ευρον καθως ειπεν αυτοις.* Vul. *Invenerunt, sicut dixit illis stantem pullum.* Agreeably to this a few MSS. but none of any note, read after *αυτοις, εδωτα τον πωλον.* The second Sy. the Sax. and the Arm. versions are also conformable to the Vul.

38. *In the highest heaven.* Ch. ii. 14. N.

42. *O that thou hadst considered, οτι ει εγινωσ και ου.* Ch. xii. 49. N.

43. *Will surround thee with a rampart, περιβαλουσι χαρακα σοι.* E. T. *Shall cast a trench about thee.* *Χαραξ* does not occur in any other place of the N. T. ; but in some places wherein it occurs in the Sep. it has evidently the sense I have here given it. Indeed a *rampart*, or mound of earth, was always accompanied with a trench or ditch, out of which was dug the earth necessary for raising the rampart. Some expositors have clearly shown, that this is a common meaning of the word in Gr. authors. Its perfect conformity to the account of that transaction, given by the Jewish historian, is an additional argument in its favour.

CHAPTER XX.

1. *Teaching—and publishing the good tidings—διδασκοντος—και ευαγγελιζομενον—.* Diss. VI. P. V. § 14.

13. *Surely, ισως.* E. T. *It may be.* Though the latter may be thought the more common signification, the former suits better the genius of the parable, and the parallel passages. Besides, the word has often that signification in profane authors. It is found but once in the version of the Seventy, 1 Sam. xxv. 21. where it is evidently used in this sense, answering to the Heb. *אֵינִי אֶחָד, profecto*, and rendered in the E. T. *surely.* It occurs in no other place of the N. T.

35. *Who shall be honoured to share in the resurrection.* It may be remarked in passing, that our Lord, agreeably to the Jewish style

of that period, calls that only the *resurrection*, which is a resurrection to glory.

CHAPTER XXI.

8. *Saying, I am the person ; and the time approacheth*, λεγοντες, οτι εγω ειμι και ο καιρος ηγγικε. The second clause, και ο καιρος ηγγικε, and the time approacheth, is capable of being understood as the words either of the false messiahs that would arise, or of our Lord himself. In the former case, the copulative και connects this clause with that immediately preceding, to wit, εγω ειμι ; in the latter, the connexion is made with the verb ελευσονται. Former expositors have, I think, in general, adopted the latter mode of interpreting, making these the words of our Lord. Of this number is Gro. who considers the second clause as equivalent to what is said, Mt. xxiv. 34. Mr. xiii. 30. *This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.* Most translators also have favoured this manner. Fr. says, *Multi venient dicentes se esse Christum ; et tempus instat.* Had he understood both classes as the words of the impostors, he would have said *instare.* Cas. to the same purpose, *Qui se eum esse dicant ; et quidem tempus instat.* Such foreign translations as do not preserve the ambiguity of the original, seem all to approve the same explanation. Some late Eng. commentators have favoured the other, and have been followed by some interpreters, Dod. and Wes. in particular. Yet, in their translations themselves, this does not appear, unless from the pointing, or the notes. As very plausible things may be said on each side of the question, and as there does not appear any thing in the context, that can be accounted decisive, I consider this as one of those ambiguities which translators ought, if possible, to preserve. Most of them, indeed, have either accidentally or intentionally done so. Of this number is the Vul. *Dicentes quia ego sum, et tempus appropinquavit.* And the Zu. *Dicentes, Ego sum Christus, et tempus instat.* As also the E. T. *Saying, I am Christ, and the time draweth near.* Bishop Pearce seems to think that the words in the following verse, ουκ ευθεις το τελος, are said in direct contradiction to the clause, ο καιρος ηγγικε, and, consequently, show this to be the assertion of

the seducers. If our Lord had employed *ὁ καιρος* in this verse, instead of *το τελος*, I should have thought the argument very strong; but, as it stands, it has no weight at all. I know no interpreter who gives the same import to *καιρος*, in the eighth verse, and to *τελος*, in the ninth. And if they refer to different events, the one cannot be in opposition to the other.

15. *To refute, αντειπειν.* E. T. *To gainsay.* The import of the declaration is well expressed by Grotius, “Cui nihil contradici possit, quod veri habeat speciem.” That their adversaries did actually *gainsay* or *contradict* them, we have from the same authority. Acts, xiii. 45. xxviii. 19. 22. It deserves, however, to be remarked, that the term in all these places is different from that used here. It is *αντιλεγειν* which, in the idiom of the sacred writers, is evidently not synonymous.

19. *Save yourselves by your perseverance, εν τη υπομονη υμων κτησασθε τας ψυχας υμων.* E. T. *In your patience possess ye your souls.* For the proper import of the word *υπομονη*, see ch. viii. 15. N. *Κτασμαι* signifies not only *I possess*, but *I acquire*, and even *I preserve* what I have acquired; for it is only thus I continue to possess it. Such phrases as *αι ψυχαι υμων* were shown, ch. xiv. 26. N. to serve, in the Hellenistic idiom, for the reciprocal pronoun. The sentence is, therefore, but another manner of expressing the same sense, which Mt. has delivered (ch. x. 22.) in these words—*The man who persevereth to the end, shall be saved, ο υπομεινας εις τελος, ουτος σωθησεται.* That the words may have a relation to a temporal, as well as to eternal, salvation, is not to be doubted; but as the whole discourse is a prophecy, a translator ought not, from the lights afforded by the fulfilment, to attempt rendering it more explicit than it must have appeared to the hearers at the time. I shall only add, in passing, that there is a small deviation from the common, in the reading of the Vul. and the Sy. versions, where we find the future of the indicative instead of the imperative; in conformity to which, three or four MSS. have *κτησεσθε* instead of *κτησασθε*. But this makes no alteration in the sense. It may be even reasonably questioned, whether there has been any difference in the Gr. copies used by those translators. The future in Heb. is often no other than a more solemn expression of the imperative:

and, therefore, if I had not had occasion to make other remarks on the verse, I should have thought this too slight a difference to be taken notice of here.

21. *Let those in the city make their escape, $\delta\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \mu\epsilon\sigma\omega\ \alpha\nu\tau\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \chi\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$.* E. T. *Let them who are in the midst of it depart out.* *Αυτης* may here, very naturally, be thought at first to refer to *Ιουδαια*, mentioned in the former part of the verse. But the sense and connexion evidently show that it relates to *Ἱερουσαλημ*, mentioned in the foregoing verse. The next member of the sentence is a confirmation of this—*καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χωραῖς, μη εἰσερχεσθῶσαν εἰς αὐτήν*. Here the fields could not be contrasted to Jerusalem, the metropolis; the contrast of *town* and *country* is familiar in every language. I do not urge that this suits better the events which soon followed: for if there were not ground for this interpretation from the context and the parallel passages in the other Gospels, it would be hazardous to determine what the inspired author has said, from what a translator may fancy he ought to have said, that the prediction might tally with the accomplishment. In this way of expounding, too much scope is given to imagination, perhaps to rooted prejudices and mere partiality.

23. *Woe unto the women with child.* Ch. vi. 24, 25, 26. N.

25. *Upon the earth, $\epsilon\pi\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$.* Some late expositors think it ought to be rendered, *upon the land*, considering the prophecy as relating solely to Judea. The words, as they stand, may, no doubt, be translated either way. I have preferred that of the common version, for the following reasons: First, though what preceded seems peculiarly to concern the Jews, what follows appears to have a more extensive object, and to relate to the nations, and the habitable earth in general. There we hear of *συννοχη εθνων*, and of the things *επερχομενων τη οικουμενη*; not to mention what immediately follows, to wit, that the son of man shall be seen coming on a cloud, with great glory and power. Nor is it at all probable that, by the term *εθνων*, *nations*, used thrice in the preceding verse, manifestly for *Gentiles*, are meant in this verse only Jews and Samaritans. 2dly. The prediction which the verse under examination introduces, is accurately distinguished by the historian, as not commencing till after the completion of the former. It was not till after the calamities which were to befall the Jews, should be end

ed; after their capital and temple, their last resource, should be invested and taken, and the wretched inhabitants destroyed, or carried captive into all nations; after Jerusalem should be trodden by the Gentiles; nay, and after the triumph of the Gentiles should be brought to a period; that the prophecy contained in this and the two subsequent verses, should begin to take effect. The judicious reader, to be convinced of this, needs only give the passage an attentive perusal.

28. *Begin to be fulfilled, Αρχομειων γινεσθαι.* Mr. v. 17. N.

30. *When ye observe them shooting forth, 'οταν προβαλωσιν ηδη, βλεποντες.* Vul. *Cum producunt jam ex se fructum.* This addition of *fructum* is not favoured by any other version except the Sax. or even by any MS. except the Cam. which has *τον καρπον αυτων.*

CHAPTER XXII.

25. *They who oppress them are styled benefactors, οι εξουσιαζοντες αυτων ενεργεται καλουνται.* E. T. *They who exercise authority upon them are called benefactors.* The verb *εξουσιαζειν*, in its common acceptation, does not mean simply *to rule*, or govern, *ποιμαινειν*, *αρχειν*, *ηγεμονειν*, or *κυβερναειν*, but *to rule with rigour* and oppression, as a despot rules his slaves. It is, in this sense, used by the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 12. *ουκ εγω εξουσιασθησομαι υπο τινος.* E. T. *I will not be brought under the power of any; that is, 'How indifferent soever in themselves the particular gratifications may be;'* for it is of this kind of spiritual subjection he is speaking, 'I will not allow myself to be enslaved by any appetite.' It seems to be our Lord's view, in these instructions, not only to check, in his Apostles, all ambition of power, every thing which savoured of a desire of superiority and dominion over their brethren, but also to restrain that species of vanity which is near a-kin to it, the affectation of distinction from titles of respect and dignity. Against this vice particularly, the clause under consideration seems to be levelled. The reflection naturally suggested by it is, How little are any the most pompous epithets which men can bestow, worthy the regard of a good man, who observes how vilely, through servility and flattery, they are sometimes prostituted to the most undeserving. That there is an

allusion to the titles much affected by monarchs and conquerors in those ages, amongst which, *benefactor*, *EUERGETES*, was one, there can be little doubt. To the same purpose, are those instructions wherein he prohibits their calling any man upon the earth their *father* or *teacher in things divine*, or assuming to themselves the title of *rabbi* or *leader*.

29, 30. *And I grant unto you to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom (forasmuch as my Father hath granted me a kingdom,) and to sit—* ἀάγω διατιθεμαι υμιν, καθως διεθετο μοι ο πατηρ μου, βασιλειαν· ινα εσθιητε και πινητε επι της τραπεξης μου, εν τη βασιλεια μου, και καθισησθε.— E. T. *And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit—*. There is evidently an indistinctness in this version, which is not warranted by the original. At first, the grant to the disciples appears to be very different from what, by the explanation subjoined, it is afterwards found to be. The first is *a kingdom*, the second, *that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom*. See Mt. xxvi. 29. ² N. *Βασιλειαν* is rendered as if it were governed by *διατιθεμαι*, and not as it is, both in reality, and to appearance, by *διεθετο*. Make but a small alteration in the pointing, remove the comma after *μου*, and place it after *βασιλειαν*, and nothing can be clearer or more explicit than the sentence. I have, for the sake of perspicuity, made an alteration on the arrangement of the words, but not greater than that made by our translators, which has the contrary effect, and involves the sentence in obscurity.

31. *Hath obtained permission. Εξητησατο*. Though with most interpreters, I said first *requested permission*, the word will bear, and the sense requires that it be rendered *obtained*.—Their danger arose chiefly, not from what Satan requested, but from what God permitted.

² *You [all] υμας*. The plural pronoun shows plainly that this was spoken of all the apostles, especially as we find it contrasted to the singular *περι σου*, directed to Peter in the same sentence. But this does not sufficiently appear in Eng. or any language wherein it is customary to address a single person in the plural. I have therefore to remove ambiguity, supplied the word [*all*].

32. *When thou hast recovered thyself, ὅν επιστρεψας.* E. T. *When thou art converted.* There is precisely the same reason against rendering *επιστρεψας*, in this place, *converted*, which there is against rendering *στραφητε*, Mt. xviii. 3. in the same way. See the note on that verse.

36. *Let him who hath no sword, sell his mantle, and buy one—ὁ μὴ ἐχὼν, πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀγοράστω μαχαίραν.* A great number of MSS. and some of note, have the two verbs in the future, *πωλήσει* and *ἀγοράσει*, instead of the imperative. In this way, it is also read in some of the oldest editions. I think, however, that there is no occasion here to desert the common reading. The sense in such prophetic speeches is the same, either way rendered. In the animated language of the Prophets, their predictions are often announced under the form of commands. The Prophet Isaiah, in the sublime prediction he has given us of the fate of the king of Babylon, thus foretells the destruction of his family (xiv. 21.): *Prepare slaughter for his children, for the iniquity of their fathers, that they do not rise, nor possess the land.* Yet the instruments by which Providence intended to effect the extirpation of the tyrant's family, were none of those to whom the prophecy was announced. The Prophet Jeremiah, in like manner, foretells the approaching destruction of the children of Zion, by exhibiting God as thus addressing the people (ix. 17, 18.): *Call for the mourning women, that they may come; and send for cunning women: and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eye-lids gush out with waters.* The matter of sorrow is predicted, by commanding the common attendants on mourning and lamentation to be gotten in readiness; here warning is given of the most imminent dangers, by orders to make the customary preparation against violence, and to account a weapon more necessary than a garment. In the prophecy of Ezekiel (xxxix. 17, 18, 19.), and in the Apocalypse (xix. 17, 18.), so far is this allegoric spirit carried, that we find orders given to brute animals to do what the Prophet means only to foretell us they will do. Indeed, this is so much in the vivid manner of scriptural prophecy, that I am astonished that a man of Bishop Pearce's abilities should have been so puzzled to reconcile this clause to our Saviour's intention of yielding without resistance, that, rather than

admit it, he would recur to an expedient, whose tendency is but too evidently to render Scripture precarious and uncertain.

38. *Here are two swords—It is enough.* The remark here made by the disciples, and our Lord's answer, show manifestly two things ; the first is, that his meaning was not perfectly comprehended by them ; the second, that he did not think it necessary at that time, to open the matter further to them. Their remark evinces that they understood him literally ; and it is, by consequence, a confirmation (if a confirmation were needed) of the common reading of verse 36. By his answer, *Ἰκανόν ἐστὶ, It is enough ;* though he declined attempting to undeceive them by entering further into the subject, he signified, with sufficient plainness, to those who should reflect on what he said, that arms were not the resource they ought to think of. For what were two swords against all the ruling powers of the nation ? The import of the proverbial expression here used by our Lord, is, therefore, this, ' We need no more ;' which does not imply that they really needed, or would use, those they had.

51. *Let this suffice, εἰτε ἕως τούτου.* E. T. *Suffer ye thus far.* This version is obscure, and susceptible of very different interpretations. All antiquity seems agreed in understanding our Lord's expression as a check to his disciples, by intimating that they were not to proceed further in the way of resistance ; as it was not to such methods of defence that he chose to recur. What is recorded by the other Evangelists (Mt. xxvi. 52, 53. J. xviii. 11.), as likewise said on the occasion, strongly confirms this explanation. Another, indeed, has been suggested ; namely, that the words were spoken to the soldiers, who are supposed, before now, to have seized his person ; and that our Lord asked of them, that they would grant him liberty to go to the man whose ear had been cut off, that he might cure him ; the only instance wherein Jesus needed the permission, or the aid, of any man, in working a miracle. An explanation this, every way exceptionable ; but it is sufficient here to take notice, that it is totally destitute of evidence. Elsner, who favours this interpretation, after giving what he takes to be the sense, in a paraphractical explanation, quotes, by way of evidence, two passages from the same author, in order to prove——what was never questioned by any body, that *ἕως,* followed by the genitive, some-

times answers to the La. *ad*. The only thing, in the present case, which requires proof, is, that such an ellipsis, made by the suppression of two principal words *με ελθειν*, is consistent with use in the language; and the only proof is precedents. Would *sinite ad istum*, in La. or, which is equivalent, *suffer to him*, in Eng. convey that sense? Yet nobody will deny, that *sinite me ire ad istum*, in the one language, and *suffer me to go to him*, in the other, clearly express it. Just so, it is admitted, that *εατε ελθειν εμε εως τουτου* would convey that sense, though *εατε εως τουτου* does not. The extent of use in Gr. is learnt only from examples, as well as in La. in Eng. Now, in the quotations brought by Elsner, there is no ellipsis at all; consequently they are not to the purpose. On the other hand, every body knows that *εως*, which is an adverb of time, when joined to *τουτου*, means commonly *hucusque, hitherto*; and that adverbs of time are occasionally used as nouns, may be easily exemplified in most languages. *Behold now*, says Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 2. *is the accepted time*—*Ιδου νυν καιρος ευπροσδεκτος*. The words of our Lord, then, in the most simple and natural interpretation, denote *Let pass what is done—Enough of this—No more of this*.

52. *Officers of the temple-guard, στρατηγους του ιερου*. E. T. *Captains of the temple*. The temple had always a guard of Levites, who kept watch in it, by turns, day and night. There are references to this practice in the O. T. both in the Prophets and in the Psalms. Over this guard, one of the priests was appointed captain; and this office, according to Josephus, was next in dignity to that of high priest. It appears from Acts iv. 1. v. 24. 26. as well as from the Jewish historian, that there was only one who had the chief command. The plural number is here used for comprehending those who were assigned to the captain as counsellors and assistants. The addition of the word *guard*, seemed to be necessary in Eng. for the sake of perspicuity.

² *Clubs, Ξυλων*. E. T. *Staves*. A *staff* is intended principally for assisting us in walking; a *club* is a weapon both offensive and defensive. The former is, in Gr. *ραβδος*; the latter, *ξυλον*. To show that these words are, in the Gospels, never used promiscuously, let it be observed, that, in our Lord's commands to his Apostles, in relation to the discharge of their office, when what concerned their own accommodation in travelling is spoken of; the word *ραβδος* is

used by all the three Evangelists, Mt. Mr. and L. who take particular notice of that transaction. But, in the account given by the same Evangelists of the armed multitude, sent by the high priests and elders to apprehend our Lord, they never employ the term *ραβδος*, but always *ξυλον*.

54. *Then they seized him, and led him away to the high priest's house, συλλαβοντες δε αυτον ηγαγον, και εισηγαγον αυτον εις τον οικον του αρχιερεως.* E. T. *Then took they him and led him, and brought him into the high priest's house.* Vul. *Comprehendentes autem eum, duxerunt ad domum principis sacerdotum.* The words *και εισηγαγον αυτον*, are not in the Cam. and two other MSS. and some Evangelistaries. The Sy. and Sax. interpreters, and therefore, probably the author of the old Itc. version, have not read them. It is plain they add nothing to the sense. *Ηγαγον εις τον οικον*, and *εισηγαγον εις τον οικον*, are the same thing. One of these, superadded to the other, is a mere tautology. Besides, there appears something of quaintness in the expression, *αυτον ηγαγον και εισηγαγον αυτον*, which is very unlike this writer's style. I have, therefore, preferred here the more simple manner of the Vul. and the Sy.

55. *When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the court, απαντων δε πυρ εν μεσω της αυλης.* E. T. *When they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall.* The expression *εν μεσω*, is an evidence that this *αυλη* was an open court. Besides, *αυλη* here appears contradistinguished to *οικος*, in the preceding verse. Mt. xxvi. 58. N.

66. *The national senate, το πρεσβυτεριον του λαου.* E. T. *The elders of the people.* I do not introduce this title here, as though there were any difficulty in explaining it, or any difference, in respect of sense, in the different translations given of it; but solely to remark, that this Evangelist is the only sacred writer who gives this denomination to the *sanhedrim*; for there can be no doubt that it is of it he is speaking. This is the only passage in the Gospel where it occurs. The same writer (Acts xxii. 5.) also applies the title *πρεσβυτεριον*, without the addition *του λαου*, to this court, or at least to the members whereof it was composed, considered as a body. I thought it allowable, where it can be done with

propriety (for it cannot in every case,) to imitate even these little differences in the style of the inspired penmen. Diss. XII. P. I. § 9, 10.

CHAPTER XXIII.

11. *A shining robe, εἶδηται λαμπραν.* E. T. *A gorgeous robe.* Vul. *Veste alba.* Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Veste splendida.* Though the Gr. word may be rendered either way, I prefer the latter, as denoting that quality of the garment which was the most remarkable; for this epithet was most properly given to those vestments wherein both qualities, white and shining, were united. That the word *λαμπρος* was used for *white*, the application of it by Polybius to the *toga* worn by the candidates for offices at Rome, if there were no other evidence, would be sufficient. But when nothing beside the colour was intended, the word *λευκος* was used, corresponding to the La. *albus*, as *λαμπρος* did to *candidus*. Such white and splendid robes were worn in the East by sovereigns. Herod caused our Lord to be dressed in such a garment, not, as I imagine, to signify the opinion he had of his innocence, but in derision of his pretensions to royalty. Perhaps it was intended to insinuate, that those pretensions were so absurd as to merit no other punishment than contempt and ridicule.

15. *He hath done nothing to deserve death, ουδεν αξιον θανατου εστι πεπραγμενον αυτω.* E. T. *Nothing worthy of death is done unto him.* This, though unintelligible, is a literal version from the Vul. Er. and Zu. *Nihil dignum morte actum est ei:* the meaning of which, as it is here connected, if it have a meaning, is, ‘Herod hath not deserved to die for any thing he hath done to Jesus.’ Now, as it is certain that this cannot be Pilate’s meaning, being quite foreign from his purpose, I see no other resource but in supposing, that *πεπραγμενον αυτω* is equivalent to *πεπραγμενον ὑπ’ αυτου*. I am not fond of recurring to unusual constructions: but here, I think, there is a necessity; inasmuch as this sentence of Pilate, interpreted by the ordinary rules, and considered in reference to his subject, is downright nonsense. As to other versions, the Sy. has rendered the words not more

intelligibly than the Vul. Cas. adopting the construction here defended, says, *nihil morte dignum ab hoc factum esse*. Be. to the same purpose, *nihil dignum morte factum est ab eo*. Lu. keeps close to the Vul. The G. F. has followed the Vul. in what regards the construction, but has introduced a supply, from conjecture, to make out a meaning,—*rien ne lui a été fait, [qui importe qu'il soit] digne de mort*. Dio. has taken the same method,—*niente gli è stato fatto [di ciò che si farebbe a uno] che avesse meritata la morte*. It is strange that Be. has not here been followed by any of those Protestant translators, who have sometimes, without necessity (where there was no difficulty in the words,) followed him in the liberties he had taken, much more exceptionable, in respect of the sense, than the present, and less defensible, in respect of the expression. Some more recent translators, both Fr. and Eng. L. Cl. Dodd. and others admit the manner of construing the sentence adopted here. I shall subjoin a few things, which had influence with me in forming a judgment of this matter. A similar example is not, I believe, to be found in the N.T. nor in the Sep.; but so many examples of *πεπραγμενον τι*, for *πεπραγμενον υπο τινος*, have been produced from classical authors, by Raphelius and Wet. as show it to have been no uncommon idiom. Now, though L. abounds in Hebraisms, as much as any sacred writer, yet he has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he could acquire only from conversing with the Gentiles, or reading their authors; and has, upon the whole, as was observed before (Preface, § 11.), greater variety in his style than any other of the Evangelists. Further, it strengthens the argument, that *πραβειν αξιον θανατου*, is a phrase not unfrequent with L. (see Acts xxv. 11. 25. xxvi. 31.) for expressing to do what deserved death; and, as the only inquiry on this occasion was, what Jesus had done, and what he deserved to suffer, there is the strongest internal probability, from the scope of the place, that it must mean what had been done by him, and not to him. Lastly, no other version that is both intelligible and suited to the context, can be given, without a much greater departure from the ordinary rules of interpretation and of syntax than that here made. To be convinced of this, one needs only consider a little the Itn. and G. F. translations of this passage above recited.

23. *Their clamours, and those of the chief priests, prevailed*—κατιδχρον αι φωναι αυτων και των αρχιερεων. Vul. *Invalescebant voces eorum*. With this, agree one MS. which omits και των αρχιερεων, and the Sax. and Cop. versions.

35. *The elect of God, ο του Θεου εκλεκτος*. This title is adopted from Isaiah, xlii. 1. and appears to be one of those by which the Messiah was at that time distinguished. Diss. V. P. IV. § 14.

43. *Paradise*. Diss. VI. P. II. § 19, 20, 21.

50. *A senator named Joseph*. Ανηρ ονοματι Ιωδηφ βουλευτης υπαρχων. E. T. *A man named Joseph, a counsellor*. The word βουλευτης occurs nowhere in the N. T. but here and in the parallel passage in Mr. Some think that it denotes a member of the *sanhedrim*, the national senate, and supreme judicatory. Father Simon says that all the Jewish doctors thus applied the term βουλευται. See his Note on Mr. xv. 43. Gro. though doubtful, inclines rather to make Joseph a city magistrate; and Lightfoot, founding also on conjecture, is positive that he was one of the council chamber of the temple. To me, the first appears far the most probable opinion. What the Evangelist advances, v. 51. is a strong presumption of this, and more than a counterbalance to all that has been urged by Gro. and Lightfoot, in support of their respective hypotheses. *He had not concurred*, says the historian, *in their resolutions and proceedings*. To the pronoun αυτων *their*, the antecedent, though not expressed, is clearly indicated by the construction to be οι βουλευται, *the senators*. And of these the crucifixion of Jesus is here represented as the resolution and the deed. With what propriety could it be called the deed of the city magistrates of Jerusalem, or (if possible, still worse) of a council which was no judicatory, being intended solely for regulating the sacred service, and inspecting the affairs of the temple? The title ευσχημων given him by Mr. shows him to have been of the highest dignity. But, admit that this does not amount to a proof that Joseph was a member of the *sanhedrim*; there is no impropriety in rendering βουλευτης *senator*. The Eng. word admits the same latitude of application with the Gr. The La. *senator* is commonly rendered into Gr. βουλευτης, and this Gr. word, though rendered by the Vul. *decurio*, is translated by Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. *senator*. This rendering is, therefore, not improper, whatever was the case. But to say *one of the council*

chamber of the temple, if that was not the fact, is a mistranslation of the word. In all dubious cases, the choice of a general term is the only safe mode of translating : but the tendency of most interpreters is, at any risk, to be particular.

54. *The sabbath approached*, σαββατον επεφωσκε. Vul. *Sabbatum illucescebat*. The Jews, in their way of reckoning the days, counted from sun-set to sun-set, thus beginning the natural day, το νυχθημερον, with the night. This had been the manner from the earliest ages. Moses, in his history of the creation, concludes the account of the several days in this manner—*And the evening and the morning were the first day* ;—and so of all the six, always making mention of the evening first. There is some reason to think that the same method of counting had, in very ancient times, prevailed in other nations. It was not, however, the way that obtained in the neighbouring countries in the time of the Apostles. Most others seem, at that time, to have reckoned as we do, from midnight to midnight ; and, in distinguishing the two constituent parts of the natural day, named the morning first. Had the Jewish practice been universal, it is hardly possible that such a phrase as σαββατον επεφωσκε, *sabbatum illucescebat*, to signify that the sabbath was drawing on, had ever arisen. The expressions, then, might have been such as Lightfoot supposes, εις σαββατον εσκοτισθη, and *obtenebrescebat in sabbatum* ; the sabbath being, as every other day, ushered in with darkness, which advances with it for several hours. The conjecture of Grotius, that L. in this expression, refers to the light of the stars, which do not appear till after sun-set, and to the moon, which gives at least no sensible light till then, is quite unsatisfactory. That the coming of night should, on this account, be signified by an expression which denotes the increase of light, is not more natural than it would be to express the progress of the morning at sun-rise, by a phrase which implies the increase of darkness, and which we might equally well account for by saying that, in consequence of the sun's rising, the stars disappear, and we no longer enjoy moon-shine. I am no better pleased with the supposition, to which Wet. seems to point, that there is an allusion here to a Jewish custom, of ushering in the sabbath by lighting lamps in their houses. The transactions spoken of in this chapter, were all without doors, where those lights could have no effect ; besides, they were too in-

considerable to occasion so flagrant a deviation from truth, as to distinguish the advance of the evening by an expression which denotes the increase of the light. Lightfoot's hypothesis is, as usual, ingenious, but formed entirely on the language and usages of modern rabbies. He observes that, with them, the Hebrew לַיְלָה , answering to the Greek $\varphi\omega\varsigma$, is used for night; and, taking it for granted that this use is as ancient as our Saviour's time, the approach of night would naturally, he thinks, be expressed by ἐπιφωσσω , *illucesco*. But, let it be observed that, as the rabbinical works quoted are comparatively recent, and as their language is much corrupted with modernisms from European and other tongues, it is not safe to infer, merely from their use, what obtained in the times of the Apostles. As to the word in question, certain it is, that we have no vestige of such a use in the O. T. There are not many words which occur oftener than לַיְלָה ; but it never means night, or has been so rendered by any translator whatever. The authors of the Sep. have never used $\varphi\omega\varsigma$ in rendering לַיְלָה , the Heb. word for *night*, nor $\nu\chi$ in rendering לַיְלָה . The word $\varphi\omega\varsigma$ never signifies *night* in the Jewish Apocryphal writings, nor in the N. T. I even suspect that, in the modern rabbinical dialect, it does not mean *night* exclusively, but the natural day, $\nu\chi\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\nu$, including both; in which case it is a mere Latinism, *lux* for *dies*. Nay, some of his own quotations give ground for this suspicion. What he has rendered *luce diei decimæ quartæ*, is literally from the original quoted *luce decima quarta*. Nor does it invalidate this opinion, that the thing mentioned, clearing the house of leaven before the passover, is, according to their present customs, dispatched in the night-time, and with candle-light. The expression may, notwithstanding, be used as generally as those employed in the law, which does not, in the discharge of this duty, confine them to the night; nor does their use of candles or lamps, in this service, show that they confined themselves to the night. Even in the day-time, these are necessary for a search, wherein not a press or corner, hole or cranny, in the house, is to be left unexplored. But admitting that the rabbies have sometimes preposterously used the word לַיְלָה , for the *night*, of which the learned author has produced the testimony of one of their glossaries, its admission into a work whose use is to interpret into proper Heb. the barbarisms and improprieties which

have, in latter ages, been foisted into their tongue, is itself sufficient evidence that it is a mere corruption. How, indeed, can it be otherwise? Moses tells us (Gen. i. 5.), that at the creation, *God called the light day, and the darkness he called night*. But this right use of words these preposterous teachers have thought proper to reverse being literally of the number of those stigmatized by the Prophet (Isaiah v. 20.) as putting *darkness for light, and light for darkness*. The way, therefore, wherein I would account for this expression of the Evangelist (a way which has been hinted by some former interpreters) is very simple. In all the nations round (the Jews, perhaps, alone excepted) it was customary to reckon the morning the first part of the day, the evening the second. Those who reckoned in this manner, would naturally apply the verb *επιφωσκει* to the ushering in of the day. L. who was, according to Eusebius, from Antioch of Syria, by living much among Gentiles, and those who used this style, or even by frequent occasions of conversing with such, would insensibly acquire a habit of using it. A habit of thus expressing the commencement of a new day, contracted where the expression was not improper, will account for one's falling into it occasionally, when, in consequence of a difference in a single circumstance, the term is not strictly proper. And this, by the way, is at least a presumption of the truth of a remark I lately made, that this Evangelist has, oftener than the rest, recourse to words and idioms which he must have acquired from the conversation of the heathen, or from reading their books. This is an expression of that kind which, though it might readily be imported, could not originate among the Jews. I shall only add, that the use which Mt. makes of the same verb (xxviii. 1.) is totally different. He is there speaking of the morning, when the women came to our Lord's sepulchre, which was about sun-rise. Here, on the contrary, the time spoken of is the approach of sun-set; for the setting of the sun made the beginning of the sabbath.

CHAPTER XXIV.

1. *With some others, και τινες ουν αυταις*. These words are wanting in two or three MSS. They are also omitted in the Vul. Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions; but are in the Sy. and the Ara. The

external evidence against their admission, compared with the evidence in their favour, is as nothing. But a sort of internal evidence has been pleaded against them. As no women are named, either here, or in the conclusion of the preceding chapter, what addition does it make to the sense to say, *with some others*? Or what is the meaning of it, where none are specified? I answer, the women spoken of here, though not named, are mentioned in the last verse but one of the foregoing chapter, under this description—*the women who had accompanied Jesus from Galilee*. Now, where is the absurdity of supposing that those pious women from Galilee were accompanied by some of our Lord's female disciples from Jerusalem and its neighbourhood? As it is certain that our Lord had there many disciples also, I see no reason why we should not here be determined solely by the weight and number of authorities.

12. *He went away musing with astonishment, on what had happened*, ἀπηλθε, προς εαυτον θαυμαζων το γεγονος. Some point the words differently, removing the comma after ἀπηλθε, and placing it after εαυτον; and, in consequence of this alteration, render the clause, *he went home wondering at what had happened*. Thus, J. xx. 10. *Απηλθον ουν παλιν προς εαυτους οι μαθηται*, is rendered in the E. T. *Then the disciples went away again unto their own home*. That the words of L. admit of such an adjustment and translation, cannot be denied. The common punctuation, however, appears to me preferable, for these reasons: 1st, It is that which has been adopted by all the ancient translations, the Cop. alone excepted. 2dly, It has a particular suitableness to the style of this Evangelist. Thus, ch. xviii. 11. *προς εαυτον ταυτα προσηχετο*, is, in the E. T. rendered, *prayed thus with himself*; though, I confess, it admits another version; and, xx. 14. *διελογιζοντο προς εαυτους*, *they reasoned among themselves*. 3dly, It appears more probable from what we are told, verse 24th of this chapter, and from the account given by J. ch. xx. that Peter did not go directly home, but returned to the place where the Apostles, and some other disciples, were assembled. And this appears to be the import of *απηλθον προς εαυτους*, J. xx. 10. which see.

18. *Art thou alone such a stranger in Jerusalem as to be unacquainted?* Συ μονος παροικεις εν Ιερουσαλημ, και μη εγνωσ;

E. T. *Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known?* There are two ways wherein the words of Cleopas may be understood by the reader : one is as a method of accounting for the apparent ignorance of this traveller ; the other as an expression of surprise, that any one who had been at Jerusalem at the time, though but a stranger, should not know what had made so much noise amongst all ranks, and had so much occupied, for some days, all the leading men in the nation, the chief priests, the scribes, the rulers, and the whole sanhedrim, as well as the Roman procurator and the soldiery. The common version favours the first interpretation ; I prefer the second, in concurrence, as I imagine, with the majority of interpreters, ancient and modern. I cannot discover with Be. any thing in it remote from common speech. On the contrary, I think it, in such a case as the present, so natural an expression of surprise that examples, remarkably similar, may be produced from most languages. Dio. O. Συ αρα, ειπε, μονος ανηκοος ει τουτων α παντες ισασιν ; *Are you the only person who have never heard what all the world knows?* Cicero, *pro Milone* : “ An vos, iudices, vero soli ignoratis, vos hospites in hac urbe versamini ; vestræ peregrinantur aures, neque in hoc pervagato civitatis sermone versantur ?”

19. *Powerful in word and deed, δυνατος εν εργω και λογω.* I have here altered the order a little, for the sake of avoiding a small ambiguity ; *in deed* might be mistaken for the adverb. The first of these phrases, *powerful in word*, relates to the wisdom and eloquence which our Lord displayed in his teaching ; the other relates to the miracles which he performed.

25. *O thoughtless men ! Ω ανοητοι.* E. T. *O fools.* The word is not Ω μωροι. The two words are not synonymous. The term last mentioned, is a term of great indignation, and sometimes of contempt ; that employed here is a term of expostulation and reproof.

29. *They constrained him, παρεβιασαντο αυτον.* How did they constrain him ? Did they lay violent hands on him, and carry him in, whether he would or not ? The sequel shows—*saying, abide with us ; for it groweth late, and the day is far spent.* The expression, in such cases, must always be interpreted according to popular usage. Usages, such as this, of expressing great urgency of solicitation by terms which, in strictness, imply force and compulsion,

are common in every tongue. How little, then, is there of candour, or at least of common sense, in the exposition which has been given by some, of a like phrase of the same writer, ch. civ. 23. *Compel them to come in, αναγκασσον εισελθειν?*

34. *Who said, The master is actually risen, and hath appeared unto Simon, λεγοντας: 'Οτι ηγεθη ο Κυριος οντως, και ωφθη Σιμων.* Mr. Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures) thinks that the words ought to be read interrogatively. "*Is the Lord risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon?*" with a sneer on the credulity or veracity of the informers, Peter and Cleopas :” for these, he thinks, were the two to whom Jesus appeared on the road to Emmaus. Lightfoot's explanation is much to the same purpose. To me the words do not appear susceptible of this version. *Ευρον λεγοντας οτι* can never be made to introduce a question. There is no different reading, except that the Cam. reads *λεγοντες* for *λεγοντας*, in which it is singular. That Peter was one of the two, is improbable. He is not named by either Mr. or L. though Cleopas is by the latter, and though Peter never fails to be mentioned by name, by the sacred historians, when they record any transaction wherein he had a part. The opinion that he was one of the two seems to have arisen from a hasty assertion of Origen. It has not the support of tradition, which has from the beginning, been divided on this point; some thinking L. himself the unnamed disciple, some, Nathanael, others one of the Seventy sent by our Lord, in his lifetime. The great object of this attempt of Markland's, is to avoid an apparent contradiction to the words of Mr. who says (xvi. 13.) that when the two disciples, at their return, acquainted the rest, “they did not believe them.” This, which is, in fact, the only difficulty, does not imply that none of them believed, but that several, perhaps the greater part, did not believe. On the other hand, when L. tells us, that the eleven and those with them said, “The Master is actually risen, and hath appeared unto Simon,” we are not to conclude that every one said this, or even believed it; but only that some believed, one of whom expressly affirmed it. Such latitude in using the pronouns is common in every language. Mt. and Mr. say that the malefactors who suffered with Jesus reproached him on the cross. From L. we learn that it was only one of them who acted thus.

36. *Peace be unto you, ειρηνη υμιν.* Vul. *Pax vobis : ego sum, nolite timere.* Two Gr. MSS. agreeably to this translation, add *εγω ειμι μη φοβεισθε.* Both the Sy. also the Cop. the Sax. and the Arm. versions, are conformable to this reading.

43. *Which he took and ate in their presence, και λαβων ενωπιον αυτων εφαγεν.* Vul. *Et cum manducasset coram eis, sumens reliquias dedit eis.* With this agree the Cop. and the Sax. versions, and the three Gr. MSS. which add *και τα επιλοιπα εδωκεν αυτοις.* There are some other variations on this verse, which it is not necessary here to specify.

44. *In the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, εν τω νομω Μωσεως και Προφηταις και Ψαλμοις.* Under these three, the Jews were wont to comprehend all the books of the O. T. Under the name *law*, the five books called the Pentateuch were included; the chief historical books were joined with *the Prophets*; and all the rest with *the Psalms*.

49. *I send you that which my Father hath promised.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 14.

² The name of Jerusalem is omitted in the Vul. and Sax. versions. It is wanted also in three noted MSS.

52. *Having worshipped him, προσκυνησαντες αυτον :* that is, *having thrown themselves prostrate before him*, as the words strictly interpreted, imply. Mt. ii. 2. ² N.

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

THE GOSPEL BY JOHN.

CHAPTER I.

1. *In the beginning was the word, εἰς ἀρχὴν ἦν ὁ λόγος.* I have here followed the E. T. and the majority of modern versions. Vul. and Lu. *In principio erat verbum.* Er. Be. and Cas. have, instead of *verbum*, used the word *sermo*. The Gr. word *λόγος* is susceptible of several interpretations, the chief of which are these two, *reason* and *speech*—*ratio* and *oratio*. The former is properly ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐνδιαθεπός, *ratio mente concepta*; the latter ὁ λόγος ὁ προφορικὸς, *ratio enunciativa*. The latter acceptance is that which has been adopted by most interpreters. If the practice of preceding translators is ever entitled to implicit regard from their successors, it is where the subject is of so abstruse a nature, as hardly to admit an exposition which is not liable to strong objections. For my part, the difference between *verbum* and *sermo* appears too inconsiderable, in a case of this kind, to induce one to leave the beaten track. Were I to desert it (which I do not think there is here sufficient evidence to warrant,) I should prefer the word *reason*, as suggesting the inward principle or faculty, and not the external enunciation, which may be called *word* or *speech*. Things plausible may be advanced in support of either mode of interpreting. In favour of the common version, *word*, it may be urged, that there is here a manifest allusion to the account given of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis, where we learn, that *God, in the beginning, made all things by his word. God said—and it was so.* In favour of the other interpretation, some have contended, that there is a reference in the expression to the doctrine of the Platonists; whilst others are no less positive, that the sacred author had, in his eye, the sentiments of Philo the Jew. Perhaps these two suppositions amount to

the same thing in effect ; at least it is more probable, that the Jewish theorist borrowed his notions on this subject from the Gr. Philosopher, than that the Evangelist should have recourse to an idolater. For my part, I entirely agree with those who think it most likely that the allusion here is to a portion of holy writ, and not to the reveries of either Philo or Plato. The passage of holy writ referred to, is Prov. viii. throughout. What is here termed *ὁ λογος*, is there *ἡ σοφια*. There is such a coincidence in the things attributed to each, as evidently shows, that both were intended to indicate the same divine personage. This passage in the Proverbs, I own admits a more familiar explanation, as regarding the happy consequences of that mental quality which we may call true or heavenly wisdom. But it is suitable to the genius of scripture prophecy to convey, under such allegorical language, the most important and sublime discoveries. Plausible arguments, therefore, (though not, perhaps, perfectly decisive,) might be urged for rendering *λογος*, in this passage, *reason*. But as the common rendering, which is also not without its plausibility, has had the concurrent testimony of translators, ancient as well as modern, and seems well adapted to the office of the Messiah, as the oracle and interpreter of God, I thought upon the whole, better to retain it.

² *The word was God, Θεος ἦν ὁ λογος.* The old English translation, authorized by Henry VIII. following the arrangement used in the original, says, *God was the word*. In this manner, Lu. also, in his Ger. translation, renders it **Cott war das wort**. Others maintain, (though, perhaps, the opinion has not been adopted by any translator,) that, as the word *Θεος* is here without the article, the clause should be, in English, *a God was the word*. But to this, several answers may be given. 1st, It may be argued, that, though the article prefixed shows a noun to be definite, the bare want of the article is not sufficient evidence that the noun is used indefinitely. See verses 6th, 12th, 13th, and 18th, of this chapter ; in all which, though the word *Θεος* has no article, there can be no doubt that it means God, in the strictest sense. 2dly, It is a known usage in the language to distinguish the subject in a sentence from what is predicated of it, by prefixing the article to the subject, and giving no article to the predicate. This is observed more carefully when the predicate happens, as in this passage, to be named first. Raphelius has given an excellent example of this from Herodotus,

Νυξ ἢ ἡμέρα εγενετο σφι μαχομενοισιν, “The day was turned into night before they had done fighting.” Here it is only by means of the article that we know this to be the meaning. Take from *ἡμέρα* the article, and prefix it to *νυξ*, and the sense will be inverted; it will be then, *the night was turned into day*.—An example of the same idiom we have from Xenophon’s Hellen, in these words, ‘*Ὁ θεος πολλακις χαιρει, τους μεν μικρους μεγαλους ποιων, τους δε μεγαλους μικρους*. Here, though the subject is named before the predicate, it is much more clearly distinguished by the article than by the place, which has not the importance in the Gr. and La. languages that it has in Ours. That the same use obtained in the idiom of the synagogue, may be evinced from several passages, particularly from Isa. v. 25. rendered by the Seventy, *Ουαι οι λεγοντες το πονηρον καλον, και το καλον πονηρον, οι τιθεντες το σκοτος φως, και το φως σκοτος, οι τιθεντες το μικρον γλυκυ, και το γλυκυ μικρον*. This is entirely similar to the example from Xenophon. In both, the same words have, and want, the article alternately, as they are made the subject, or the predicate, of the affirmations. I shall add two examples from the N. T. *πνευμα ο θεος*, J. iv. 24. ; and *παντα τα εμα σα εστιν*, L. xv. 31.

3. *All things were made by it ; and without it*—4. *In it was life*. E. T. *All things were made by him ; and without him*—*In him was life*. It is much more suitable to the figurative style here employed, to speak of *the word*, though denoting a person, as a thing, agreeably to the grammatical idiom, till a direct intimation is made of its personality. This intimation I consider as made, verse 4th, *In it was life*. The way of rendering here adopted, is, as far as I have had occasion to observe, agreeable to the practice of all translators, except the English. In the original, the word *λογος*, being in the masculine gender, did not admit a difference in the pronouns. In the Vul. the noun *verbum* is in the neuter gender. Accordingly, we have, in the second verse, *Hoc (not hic) erat in principio apud Deum*. In most of the oblique cases, both of *hic* and *ipse*, the masculine and the neuter are the same. In Italian, the name is *parola*, which is feminine. Accordingly the feminine pronoun is always used in referring to it. Thus Dio. *Essa era nel principio appo Iddio, Ogni cosa e stata fattu per essa ; e senza essa*.—The same thing may be observed of all the Fr. interpreters who

translate from the Gr. As they render *λογος* by *parole*, a noun of the feminine gender, the pronoun which refers to it is always *elle*. In Ger. which, in respect of structure, resembles more our own language than either of the former does, the noun *Wort* is neuter. Accordingly, in Luther's translation, the pronoun employed is *dasselbige*, which is also neuter, and corresponds to *itself*, in Eng. As to English versions, it is acknowledged that all posterior to the common translation have in this implicitly followed it. But it deserves to be remarked that every version which preceded it, as far as I have been able to discover, uniformly employed the neuter pronoun, *it*. So it is in that called the Bishop's Bible, and in the G. E. Beside, that this method is more agreeable to grammatical propriety, it evidently preserves the allusion better which there is in this passage to the account of the creation given by Moses, and suggests more strongly the analogy that subsists between the work of creation and that of redemption, in respect of the same Almighty agent by whom both were carried into execution; for, *by him God also made the worlds*, Heb. i. 2. Add to all this, that the antecedent to the pronoun *it*, can only be *the word*; whereas the antecedent to *him* may be more naturally concluded to be *God*, the nearest noun; in which case, the information given by the Evangelist, verse 3d, amounts to no more than what Moses has given us in the beginning of Genesis, to wit, that God made all things; and what is affirmed in verse 4th, denotes no more than that God is not inanimate matter, the universe, fate, or nature, but a living being endowed with intelligence and power. I believe every candid and judicious reader will admit, that something more was intended by the Evangelist. Nor is there any danger lest the terms should, by one who gives the smallest attention to the attributes here ascribed to *the word*, be too literally understood. Let it be observed further, that the method here taken is that which, in similar cases, is adopted by our translators. Thus it is the same divine personage who, in verse 4th, is called *the light of men*; to which, nevertheless, the pronoun *it* is applied, verse 5th, without hurting our ears in the least.

² *Without it, not a single creature was made, χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν ο γεγονεν.* Some critics, by a different pointing, cut off the two last words, *ο γεγονεν*, from this sentence, as redundant, and prefix them to the following, making verse 4th run thus,

ὁ γεγενεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. *What was made in it was life.* The Vul. is susceptible of the like difference in meaning, from the different ways of pointing, as the Gr. is. The same may be said of the Sy. and of some other translations both ancient and modern. In languages which do not admit this ambiguity, or in which translators have not chosen to retain it, the general inclination appears to have been to the meaning here assigned. It is urged, in favour of the other, that it is much in John's manner, to begin sentences with the word or words which concluded the sentence immediately preceding. This is true, and we have some instances of it in this chapter; but it is also true, that it is much in the manner of this Evangelist to employ repetitions and tautologies, for the sake of fixing the reader's attention on the sentiments, and rendering them plainer. Of this, the present Gospel, nay, this very chapter, affords examples. Thus, verse 7th, ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυριον, ἵνα μαρτυρησῆ: verse 20th, ὡμολογησθε:—καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὡμολογησεν.—Admitting, therefore, that both interpretations were equally favoured by the genius of the tongue, and the Apostle's manner of writing, the common interpretation is preferable, because simpler and more perspicuous. The apparent repetition in this verse is supposed, not implausibly, to suggest, that not only the matter of the world was produced, but every individual being was formed by the word.

5. *The light shone in darkness, but the darkness admitted it not, το φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτία φαίνει· καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτοῦ οὐ κατέλαβεν.* E. T. *The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.* Nothing is a more distinguishing particularity of this writer's style, than the confounding of the tenses. It is evident, from the connexion of these clauses, that the tense ought to be the same in both. And though it might admit some defence that, in clauses connected as those in the text, the first should be expressed in the past, and the second in the present, the reverse is surely, on the principles of grammar, indefensible. I have employed the past time in both, as more suitable to the strain of the context. I think also it makes a clearer sense; inasmuch as the passage alludes to the reception which Jesus Christ, here called the light, met with, whilst he abode upon the earth, and the mistakes of all his countrymen (the disciples themselves not excepted) in regard to his office and character.

9. *The true light was he who*—*Ἦν το φως αληθινον 'ο*—E. T. *That was the true light which*—When this verse, in the original, is compared with the foregoing, it appears, upon the first glance, to be in direct contradiction to it: verse 8th, *ουκ ην εκεινος το φως*; verse 9th, *ην το φως*. As if we should say, in Eng. *that man was not the light*—*He was the light*. But, on attending more closely, we find that, in verse 8th, *εκεινος*, referring to John the Baptist, is the subject of the proposition; whereas, in verse 9th, *το φως* is the subject. In this view, there is a perfect consistency between the two assertions, as they relate to different subjects. For the greater perspicuity, I have rendered what is affirmed of the true light, verse 9th, *he who coming*, not *that which coming*, though this is the more literal version. My reason is, because, in the following verses, this light is spoken of always as a person. Now, the best place for introducing this change of manner, is doubtless that wherein an explanation is purposely given of the phrase *το φως το αληθινον*. And that there is such a change of manner in the original, is manifest. Thus the pronoun referring to *φως*, verse 5th, is *αυτο*, in the neuter; but, after the explanation given, verse 9th, we find in verses 10th, 11th, and 12th, *αυτον*, in the masculine.

² *Who, coming into the world, enlighteneth every man*, *'ο φωτιζει παντα ανθρωπον ερχομενον εις τον κοσμον*. E. T. *Which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*. Vul. *Quæ illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum*. I have observed (Diss. XII. P. I. § 22.) that the word *ερχομενον*, in this place, is equivocal, as it may be understood to agree either with *φως* or with *ανθρωπον*. As the ambiguity could not well be preserved in Eng. I have preferred the former method of rendering. Most modern translators, Itn. Fr. and Ger. as well as ours, have, with the Vul. preferred the latter. The former way has been adopted by Cas. and Leo de Juda, in La.; by L. Cl. and Beau. in Fr.; by the An. translator and Dod. in Eng. The reasons which determined my choice, are the following: 1st, *'Ο ερχομενος εις τον κοσμον*, is a periphrasis by which the Messiah was at that time commonly denoted [as ch. vi. 14. xviii. 37.]. 2dly, He is in this Gospel once and again distinguished as *the light that cometh into the world*. Thus, ch. iii. 19. *Now this is the condemnation, that the light (το φως) is come into the world*:—ch. xii. 46. *I am come a light into the world*. 3dly, I do not find,

on the other hand, that *ερχομενος εις κοσμον*, *who cometh into the world*, is ever employed by the sacred writers as an addition to *πας ανθρωπος*, *every man*. I am far from pretending that words, not absolutely necessary, are not sometimes used in Scripture to render the expression more forcible. But it must be allowed to have weight in the present case, that a phrase, which never occurs in the application that suits the common version, is familiar in the application that suits the version given here. 4thly, The meaning conveyed in this version appears more consonant to fact than the other. To say that the Messiah, by coming into the world, lighteth every man, is, in my apprehension, no more than to say that he has, by his coming, rendered the spiritual light of his Gospel accessible to all, without distinction, who choose to be guided by it. The other, at least, seems to imply, that every individual has in fact been enlightened by him. Markland observes (Bowyer's conjectures,) that if *ερχομειον* agreed with *ανθρωπον*, it would have probably had the article, and been *τον ερχομενον*. But on this I do not lay stress; for though the remark is founded in the Gr. idiom, such minute circumstances are not always minded by the Evangelists.

11. *He came to his own home, and his own family did not receive him*, *εις τα ιδια ηλθε, και οι ιδιοι αυτον ου παρελαβον*. E. T. *He came unto his own, and his own received him not*. The E. T. is right, as far as it goes, but not so explicit as the original. The distinction made by the author between *τα ιδια* and *οι ιδιοι*, is overlooked by the interpreter. As by that distinction the country of Judea, and the people of the Jews, are more expressly marked, I have thought it worthy of being retained. For a similar phrase to *εις τα ιδια*, see L. ii. 49. N. Though *τα ιδια* commonly means *home*, this is not always to be understood strictly for *one's own house*. A man naturally considers his *country*, when he is at a distance from it, as his *home*, and his *countrymen*, as those of his *family*. Diss. XII. P. IV. § 8.

12, 13. *Children of God, who derive their birth not from blood*. That is, children by a generation spiritual and divine, which has nothing in common with natural generation.

14. *The word became incarnate*, *ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο*. E. T. *The word was made flesh*. In the language of the synagogue, the

term *σαρξ* was so often employed to denote a *human being*, that the Evangelist's expression would not sound so harshly in the ears of those accustomed to that idiom, as the literal version of the words does in ours. Besides, *was made* does not entirely correspond to *εγενετο* as used here, being a translation rather of the La. *factum est*, than of the Gr. I have for these reason preferred the phrase *became incarnate*, which, if it does not so much trace the letter of the original as the common rendering does, is closer to the sense, and sufficiently simple and intelligible. This expression, *The word became incarnate* has been thought by some, not implausibly, to have been pointed by the Evangelist against the error of the *Docetæ*, who denied the human nature of Christ, supposing him to have been a man only in appearance; and the expression, *The word was God*, v. 1. to have been pointed against the error of the Ebionites, who denied his divine nature, affirming that he was no more than a man.

² *Sojourned*, *εσκηνωσεν*. E. T. *Dwelt*. Vul. Ar. Er. Zu. Cas. *Habitavit*. Be. *Commoratus est*. Most foreign versions follow the Vul. An. *Had his tabernacle*. Dod. *Pitched his tabernacle*. Wes. and Wy. *Tabernacled*. The rest follow the common version. The primitive signification of the verb *εσκηνωω*, from *εσκηνη* *tent* or *tabernacle*, is, doubtless, *to pitch a tent*, or *dwelt in a tent*. But words come insensibly to deviate from their first signification. This has evidently happened to the verb in question. As a tent, from its nature, must be a habitation of but short continuance, the verb formed from it would quickly come to signify to reside for a little time, more as a sojourner than as an inhabitant. This is well deduced by Phavorinus, *εσκηνη, η προσωκαιρος κατοικια εσκηνωω, το προς καιρον οικηδιν ποιουμαι*, which exactly suits the sense of *commoror*, *I sojourn*. It must be owned also (as may be evinced from unexceptionable authorities,) that the verb means sometimes simply *to dwell*, in the largest sense, without any limitation from the nature, or the duration, of the dwelling. Thus the inhabitants of heaven are called (Rev. xii. 12. and xiii. 6.) *οι εν ουρανοις εσκηνοντες*. Nay, which is still stronger, it is made use of to express God's abode with his people after the resurrection, which is always represented as eternal, Rev. xxi. 3. But we may be the less surprised at this, when we consider that *εσκηνη* itself is used (Lu. xvi. 9.) for a permanent habitation, and joined with the epithet *αιωνιος*. See N. 3. on that

verse. We cannot, therefore deny that the manner wherein the word is rendered by the Vul. and the E. T. is entirely defensible. As the term, however, admits either interpretation; and as the word for *to dwell* commonly used in this Gospel, and even in this chapter, is different; and as, considering the shortness of our Lord's life, especially of his ministry, he may be said more properly to have *sojourned* than to have *dwelt* amongst us; I have preferred Be.'s interpretation.

15. I look upon this verse as a parenthesis, in which the testimony of John is anticipated, verse 16th being in immediate connexion with verse 14th. It is for this reason I have not only enclosed verse 15th in hooks, but introduced it by the words *it was*, which render the connexion closer. This will appear more evidently from what is to be remarked on verse 16th.

² *Is preferred to me*, *εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν*. Vul. *Ante me factus est*. Er. and Zu. *Antecessit me*. Cas. *Ante me fuit*. Be. *Antepositus est mihi*. Dio. *M'e antiposto*. G. F. *Est preferé a moi*. L. Cl. *Est plus que moi*. Beau. *M'est préféré*. Ger. **vor mir gewesen ist**. E. T. Dod. Hey. Wes. Wy. Wor. *Is preferred before me*. An. *Was before me*. There are but two meanings in all the variety of expressions employed in translating this passage. Some make it express *priority* in time, others *pre-eminence* in dignity. With the former we should undoubtedly class the Vul. and yet most of those who have translated from it, must be numbered among the latter. Thus the translators of P. R. and Sa. say, *A été préféré a moi*. Si. *Est au dessus de moi*. But, though the Vul. and the other Latin translators, Be. alone excepted, have adopted the first method; all the translators into modern languages I am acquainted with, Romish or Protestant (except Lu. the An. and the Rh.), have followed Be. in preferring the second. Were I here translating the Vul. I should certainly say with the interpreters of Rheims, *was made before me*, and should be ready to employ Si.'s language against himself, accusing him (with better reason than he has accused Be. and the P. R. interpreters) of giving for a version, a mere comment which ought to have been put in the margin. But, as I do not translate from the Vul. the case is different. Wh. indeed, a commentator of known and deserved reputation, thinks the proper import of *εμπροσθεν* to be *before in time*, and renders the Gr. expression *is before me*. "I find no instance," says he,

“ where *εμπροσθεν μου γεγοιεν* signifies, he was preferred before me, and therefore rather choose to retain the proper import of the words.” Maldonat, another commentator, justly celebrated for critical abilities and acuteness, is of an opinion directly opposite to Wh.’s. He affirms, that in Scripture *εμπροσθεν* never expresses priority of time. “ Ut multi notaverunt, non dixit *προ μου*, sed *εμπροσθεν μου*; præpositio autem *εμπροσθεν* nusquam in sacris literis reperitur tempus significare.” Be. appears to have thought so also when he said, “ Ego istos libenter rogem, ut vel unum ex Novi Testamenti libris exemplum proferant in quo *εμπροσθεν* tempus declaret.” Opinions so contrary cannot be both true; but both may be false, and I suspect are so. That *εμπροσθεν* in the New Testament is sometimes expressive of time, may be argued from these words of the Baptist, ch. iii. 28. *I am not the Messiah, but am sent before him. εμπροσθεν εκεινου.* There is at the same time, it must be confessed, some relation to place here also. The word *εμπροσθεν* in the most common acceptation, answers to the Latin *coram*, not seldom to *præ*, more rarely to *ante*. In the sense of preference or superiority, it is, doubtless, employed by the Seventy, Gen. xviii. 20. *εθηκεν τον Εφραιμ εμπροσθεν του Μανασσε, He set Ephraim before Manasse*: for though it may be said that Ephraim was the first named, it is only the preference implied as given to the younger brother, which seems to have been regarded by their father Joseph. Chrysostom also, and other Gr. expositors, interpret in the same manner the words in the passage under consideration. Add to this that, in those places of the Gospel, which are pretty numerous, where priority in time alone is referred to, the word is never *εμπροσθεν*, but either *προ* or *πριν*, with the genitive of the noun, or the infinitive of the verb. See in this Gospel (amongst other places) ch. i. 48. iv. 49. v. 7. viii. 58. Another argument in favour of this interpretation is, that priority in time appears to be marked by the succeeding clause *πρωτος μου ην*, to be considered immediately. Now to give the same meaning to both clauses, is to represent the Evangelist as recurring to a sophism which logicians call *idem per idem*, that is, proving a thing by itself, repeated with only some variety in the expression; inasmuch that his reasoning would amount to no more than this, *He was before me, because he was before me.*

3 For he was before me, *ὅτι πρῶτος μου ἦν*. Vul. Eg. Zu. Be. *Quia prior me erat*. Cas. *Quippe qui prior me sit*. The Sy. (though, in the former clause, the expression may be thought ambiguous) is clearly to the same purpose, with the aforesaid versions in this. In the same manner also Dio. Lu. and the Fr. translators, except Beau. who says, *Parce qu'il est plus grand que moi*. With this agrees Hey. *For he is my superior*. The other Eng. versions concur with the E. T. The word *πρῶτος* is no doubt a superlative and signifies not only first in time, but often also first in dignity and rank. When it is used in this way, it is commonly followed, like other superlatives, by the genitive plural of that which is the subject of comparison; or, if the subject be expressed by a collective noun, by the genitive singular. Thus (Mr. xii. 29.) *πρωτη πασων των εντολων* is *the chief of all the commandments*, (Acts xxviii. 17.) *τους οντας των Ιουδαιων πρωτους*, *the chief of the Jews*. In like manner (Mr. vi. 21.) *οι πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας*, and (L. xix. 47.) *οι πρωτοι του λαου*; for *λαος* is a collective noun, so also is *Γαλιλαια* the name of a country, when used by a trope for the inhabitants. But in the expression in question, there is neither collective nor genitive plural; *πρῶτος* cannot therefore be rightly understood as a superlative. But is there any similar example in the sacred writers? There is one similar in this very Gospel (xv. 18.), *εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν*, concerning the meaning of which, though the construction is unusual, there has hardly been, till very lately, a diversity of opinion amongst interpreters. These have generally agreed in rendering the passage, *it hated me before it hated you*. The sense which has been put on the word *πρῶτος*, and so strenuously defended by Dr. Lardner, shall be considered in the note on that place. Till then I shall take it for granted that what has hitherto been the commonest explanation of the term, is also the clearest. Now, by every principle of sound criticism, we ought to explain the doubtful by the clear, especially as both examples, which are all the examples that Scripture affords us, are from the same pen; and as the passage thus explained yields a sense which is both just and apposite, there being at least an apparent reference to the information he had given us concerning the *λογος*, *the word*, in the beginning of the chapter.

16. *Of his fulness we all have received, even grace for his grace.*
Εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν, και χαριν αντι

χαριτος. E. T. *Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.* The context shows that the possessive pronoun *αυτου*, *his*, refers to *ὁ λογος*, *the word*, which, he says, became incarnate. But what is the import of the clause *grace for grace*? Is it that we receive grace, in return for the grace we give? So says L. Cl. availing himself of an ambiguity in the Gr. word *χαρις*, which (like *grace* in Fr.) signifies not only a favour bestowed, but thanks returned; and maintaining that the sense is, that God gives more *grace* to those who are thankful for that formerly received; a position which, however just, it requires an extraordinary turn of imagination to discover in this passage. Is it, as Dod. Wes. and Wy. render it, *grace upon grace*, that is, grace added to grace? I should not dislike this interpretation, if this meaning of the preposition *αυτι* in Scripture, were well supported. It always there denotes, if I mistake not, *instead of*, *answering to*, or *in return for*. Is it a mere pleonasm? Does it mean (as Grotius would have it) *grace gratuitous*? I do not say that such pleonastic expressions are unexampled in sacred writ; but I do say, that this sense given to the idiom is unexampled. The word in such cases is *δωρεαν*, as Rom. iii. 4. *Δικαιουμενοι δωρεαν τη αυτου χαριτι*. If, instead of giving scope to fancy, we attend to the context and the construction of the words, we shall not need to wander so far in quest of the meaning. In verse 14th we are informed, that *the word became incarnate, and sojourned amongst us full of grace and truth*. It is plain that the 15th verse, containing the Baptist's declaration, must be understood as a parenthesis. And it actually is understood so by all expositors; inasmuch as they make *αυτου* here refer to *λογος* in verse 14th. The Evangelist resuming the subject, which, (for the sake of inserting John's testimony,) he had interrupted, tells us that all we his disciples, particularly his apostles, have received of his *fulness*. But of what was he full? It had been said expressly, that he was *full of grace*. When, therefore, the historian brings this additional clause concerning *grace* in explanation of the former (for on all hands the conjunction *και* is here admitted to be explanatory,) is it not manifestly his intention to inform us, that of every *grace* wherewith he was filled, his disciples received a share? The pronoun *αυτου*, which occurs after *πληρωματος*, must be understood as repeated after *χαριτος*, the omission whereof in such cases is so common as

scarcely to be considered as an ellipsis. I shall give a few similar examples out of many which might be produced, Mt. xii. 50. *αυτος μου αδελφος, και αδελφη, και μητηρ εστι* ; where the pronoun *μου* is prefixed to the first noun, and left to be supplied by the sense before the other two. 1 Tim. vi. 1. *ινα μη το ονομα του Θεου και η διδασκαλια βλασφημηται* ; where the sense requires the pronoun *αυτου*, or the repetition of *του Θεου* after *διδασκαλια* ; and to give one example from this Gospel, ch. vi. 52. *πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα φαγειν* ; where, if we do not supply from the sense *αυτου* after *σαρκα*, we shall give a very different meaning to the question, and one perfectly unsuited to the context. But to return to the words under examination ; when the immediate connexion between the 16th and the 14th verses is attended to, the meaning of the clause is equally obvious as that of any of the foregoing examples. *The word incarnate, says the Apostle, resided amongst us full of grace and truth ; and of his fulness we all have received, even grace for his grace* ; that is, of every grace or celestial gift, conferred above measure upon him, his disciples have received a portion, according to their measure. If there should remain a doubt, whether this were the sense of the passage, the words immediately following seem calculated to remove it. *For the law was given by Moses, the grace and the truth came by Jesus Christ*. Here the Evangelist intimates that Jesus Christ was as truly the channel of divine grace to his disciples, as Moses had been of the knowledge of God's law to the Israelites. I am happy to find that in this criticism I concur with the learned Dr. Clarke.

17. *The grace and the truth, η χαρις και η αληθεια*. E. T. *grace and truth*. The article in this place ought by no means to be omitted. These nouns are often used emphatically as names for the gospel dispensation ; and are here contrasted as such to *ο νομος* the law, the name given to the Mosaic economy. *Η χαρις* sometimes with, and sometimes without, an addition, is thus, if I mistake not, employed in these and other passages, which the reader may consult at his leisure ; Acts, xiii. 43. xx. 32. 2 Cor. vi. 1. Gal. ii. 21. v. 4. 2 Thess. i. 12. Tit. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 12. ; and *η αληθεια* in the following, J. viii. 32. xvi. 13. xvii. 17. 2 Cor. iv. 2. xiii. 8. Gal. iii. 1. v. 7. Eph. iv. 21. 2 Thess. ii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 15. iii. 8. iv. 4. Tit. i. 14. Heb. x. 26. Ja. v. 19. 1 Pet. i. 22. 2 Pet. ii. 2. 1 J. ii. 21. 2 J. 2. 3 J. 8.

18. *That is in the bosom of the Father*, ch. iii. 13. N.

19. *Now this is the testimony of John.* Καὶ ἀντηρεστιν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωαννοῦ. A little attention to the words in the original will convince the judicious reader that there ought to be a full stop here, and that this ought to be read as a distinct sentence. The next sentence, which includes the rest of the 19th verse, and the whole of the 20th, derives both simplicity and perspicuity from this manner of dividing.

21. *Who then?* τί οὖν; E. T. *What then?* Between the two questions, *What art thou?* and *Who art thou?* put on such an occasion as the present, by such men as the messengers of the Pharisees, to such a person as John, there is no imaginable difference, in respect of meaning. Accordingly the same answer is equally adapted to either question. But there is in our language an essential difference in meaning between the words *What then?* and *Who then?* The former, though it would be readily denominated a literal version of the Gr. τί οὖν, conveys to our mind a sense totally different: the latter, with an inconsiderable difference in point of form, entirely coincides in import with the original expression; for in such cases, as was just now observed, *what* and *who* are equivalent. But in combining words into a phrase, the result is often different from what we should expect from the words, of which the phrase is combined, considered severally. And this is one of the many reasons which render a literal version often a very unjust as well as obscure version. As to the point we are here concerned with, *what then?* has acquired an idiomatical acceptation which answers exactly to the Fr. *Qu'inferez vous de lu?* *What would you infer from that?* than which nothing could be more foreign to the purpose. I am surprised that all the later Eng. versions, except the An. who omits the question entirely, have here implicitly followed the E. T. The foreign translators have in general done justice to the sense.

² *Art thou Elijah?* He said, *I am not.* There is here an apparent contradiction to the words of our Lord concerning John, Mt. xi. 14. *This is the Elijah that was to come.* But Jesus, in the passage quoted, evidently refers to the words of Malachi, his purpose being to inform his disciples that John was Elijah, in the meaning of that Prophet, and that the Prophet's prediction

was accomplished in the Baptist, inasmuch as he came in the spirit and power of Elijah. But when the question was proposed to John, the laws of truth required that he should answer it, according to the sense wherein the words were used by the proposers. He could not otherwise have been vindicated from the charge of equivocating. The intended purport of their question, he well knew, was, whether he acknowledged that he was individually the Prophet Elijah returned from heaven to sojourn again upon the earth; for, in this manner they explained the prediction. To this he could not, without falsehood, answer in the affirmative.

³ *Art thou the prophet? ὁ προφητης ει συ; E. T. Art thou that prophet?* The latter expression is evidently unsuitable to our idiom, unless some prophet had been named in the preceding part of the conversation, to whom the pronoun *that* could refer. In this our translators have too implicitly followed Be. who says, *Es tu propheta ille?* Not that I condemn Be. for this version. I think, on the contrary, that as the article was quite necessary here, and this was the only way of supplying it in La. he did right. Accordingly Er. and Leo de Juda had done the same before him. But there was no occasion for this method in Eng. which has articles. I own, at the same time, that in the way wherein the question is expressed in the Vul. and in Cas. the most natural version would be, *Art thou a prophet?* which is quite a different question: nay, I am persuaded that, if this had been the question, the Baptist's answer would not have been in the negative. Our Lord, we know, calls him (Mt. xi. 11.) *a prophet than whom there had not arisen a greater* under the Mosaic dispensation. Besides, the Gr. is quite explicit, and the article here perfectly well supported. It is also repeated with the word *προφητης*, verse 25th, and of the best authority, notwithstanding the dissent of Heinsius and Mill. Yet some translators, even from the Gr. have rendered the question indefinitely. Of this number are Lu. and Beau. among foreigners, and of Eng. translators the An. Dod. and Wor. To me it is evident, both from what is said here, and from other hints in the N. T. that there was at that time a general expectation in the people, of some great prophet, beside Elijah, who was soon to appear, and who was well known by the emphatical appellation *the prophet*, with-

out any addition or description. In ch. vi. 40, 41, *the prophet* is distinguished from the Messiah, as he is here from Elijah.

23. *I am he whose voice proclaimeth in the wilderness, Εγω φωνη βωωντος εν τη ερημω.* E. T. *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness.* In such declarations the general purport is alone regarded by the speaker; the words ought not, therefore, to be too grammatically interpreted. John, instead of giving a description of his own character and office, refers those who questioned him, to the words of the prophet Isaiah, in which they would find it. What he here says of himself, is to be understood no otherwise than we understand what Mt. says of him, ch. iii. 3. Interpretations to be formed from the manifest scope, not from the syntactic structure, of a sentence, are not unfrequent in scripture. Thus. Rev. i. 12. *Επεστρεψα βλεπειν την φωνην,* literally, *I turned to see the voice.*—The like may be observed in some of the parables, as Mt. xiii. 24. and 45. In one of these places the kingdom of heaven is, according to the scope of the passage, compared to a field; but, according to the letter, to the proprietor: in the other it is compared, apparently, to a merchant, but in fact to a pearl. Several other instances occur in the Gospels. As on such points, the genius of modern languages is more fastidious than that of the ancient, it would savour more of the superstitious and servile spirit of the synagogue, or of the *ζακοξηλια* of an Arias or an Aquila, than of the liberal spirit of our religion, to insist on a version of these passages scrupulously literal.

28. *Bethany.* E. T. *Bethabara.* In the common Gr. it is *Βηθαβαρα.* But the MSS. which read *Βηθανια,* are, both in number and in value, more than a counterpoise to those in which we find the vulgar reading. Add to these the Vul. the Sax. and both the Sy. versions, together with Nonnus' Gr. paraphrase of this Gospel, which is entitled to be put on the footing of an ancient translation. Also several ancient authors, and some of the best editions, read so. There is ground to think that the change of *Bethany* into *Bethabara,* took its rise from a conjecture of Origen, who, because its situation mentioned here does not suit what is said of Bethany, where Lazarus and his sisters lived, changed it into Bethabara, the place mentioned, Judg. vii. 24. where our translators have rendered it Beth-barah. But one thing is cer-

tain, that, in several instances, the same name was given to different places, and this *Bethany* seems here to be expressly distinguished from another of the name, by the addition *παραν του Ιορδανου*, upon the *Jordan*. It adds also to the probability of the reading here adopted, that *Bethany*, by its etymology, signifies a place or house close by a ferry.

33. *I should not have known him.* This has been thought by some not perfectly consistent with what L. acquaints us concerning the connexion of their families, and particularly with what we are told, Mt. iii. 14. ; where we find, that John, when Jesus came to him to be baptized, modestly declined the office, and freely acknowledged the superiority of the latter. But there is no absurdity in supposing that this was in consequence of what the Baptist knew concerning our Lord's personal character, his superior wisdom and sanctity. Nay, he might have known further, that he was a Prophet, and highly honoured of God, and yet not have known or even suspected, that he was the Messiah, till the descent of the Holy Ghost at his baptism. All that is affirmed here is, that, till this evidence was given him, he did not know him to be the Messiah. The same solution of this difficulty is given, I find, by Mr. Palmer. See his letter prefixed to Priestley's Harmony.

41. *A name equivalent to Christ, ὁ ἐστὶ μεθερμηνευομενον ὁ Χριστος.* E. T. *Which is, being interpreted, the Christ.* In all the best MSS. and editions, the article in Gr. before *Χριστος* is wanting. As the intention here is only to point out the coincidence of the two names, we must be sensible that it was not necessary.

43. *Cephas, which denoteth the same as Peter, Κηφας ὁ ἐρμηνευεται Πητρος.* E. T. *Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone.* I have put *which denoteth the same as Peter*, in a different character, as the words of the historian, and not of our Lord. We ought to consider that this Evangelist wrote his Gospel in a Grecian city of Asia Minor, and, for this reason, was the more careful to translate into Gr. the Heb. or Chal. names, given for a special purpose, whereof they were expressive. There was the greater reason for doing so in the two cases occurring in this and the preceding verse, as the Greek names were become familiar to the Asiatic converts, who were unacquainted with the Oriental

names. The sacred writer had a twofold view in it ; first, to explain the import of the name ; secondly, to prevent his readers from mistaking the persons spoken of. They all knew who, as well as what, was meant by *Christos* ; but not by the Heb. word *Messiah*. In like manner they knew who was called *Peter*, but might very readily mistake *Cephas* for some other person. When a significant name was given to a man or woman, it was customary to translate the name, when he or she was spoken of in a different tongue. Thus, *Thomas* was in Gr. *Didymus* ; and *Tabitha* was *Dorcas*. Now, it deserves our notice, that a translator from the Gr can, for the most part, answer only one of the two purposes above mentioned. The Gr. to those who cannot read it, is equally unintelligible with the Heb. To give the Gr. name, therefore, to the Eng. reader, is not to explain the Heb. For this reason, the interpreter ought to consider which of the two purposes suits best the scope of the place, and to be directed, by this consideration, in his version. The other purpose he may supply by means of the margin. To me it appears of more importance, in these instances, to be ascertained of the sameness of the person denominated both *Messiah* and *Christ*, and also of him called *Cephas* and *Peter*, than to know that the two former words signify *anointed*, and the two latter *rock*. I have, therefore, taken the method adopted by the Eng. translators as to the former, but not as to the latter. They have retained *Christ* in the version and put *anointed* on the margin. The word *Petros* they have translated *a stone*. The same way ought certainly to have been followed in both. As far as I can judge of the scope of the passage, it is clearly the intention of the writer, on the first mention of some principal persons in his history, in order to prevent all mistakes that may, in the sequel, arise about them, to give their different names at once, with this intimation, that they are of the same import, and belong to the same person. Thus, we have here, in one verse, all the names by which this Apostle is distinguished—*Simon*, son of *Jonah*, *Cephas* and *Peter*. Again, if the sacred penman had more in view, to acquaint us with the signification of the name, than to prevent our mistaking the person, he would probably have translated *Cephas* into Gr. *πετρα*, not *Πετρος*. The former is always used in the N. T. and in the Sep. for *a rock*, and never the latter. I

acknowledge that *πετρος*, in Gr. authors, and *πετρα*, are synonymous; but, in the use of the sacred writers, *Πετρος* is invariably, and *πετρα* never a proper name. Nay, in the passage, Mt. xvi. 18. wherein the signification of the word is pointed out, as the reason of assigning the name, the word is changed in the explanation given—*ὄυ εἰ Πετρος· καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πετρᾷ*. This would not have been done, if *Πετρος* had ever been used by them for a rock. Accordingly, in the Sy. version, there is no change of the word; Cephaz, or rather Kephaz, serving equally for both. The change was evidently made in the Gr. for the sake of the gender; *πετρα*, being feminine, was not a suitable name for a man. The word *Πετρος*, however, being preferred by the Evangelist to *πετρα*, shows evidently that it was more his view to indicate the person, than to explain the name. So the author of the Vul. understood it, who renders the words *quod interpretatur Petrus*, not *petra*. Let it be observed further, that this Apostle is never afterwards named by this Evangelist *Cephas*, but always Peter. Now, in consequence of excluding that name out of this verse, the very purpose, as I imagine, of John's introducing the name into it, is defeated; as, from this Gospel at least, the mere Eng. reader would not discover, when he hears afterwards of Peter, that it was the same person whom our Saviour, on this occasion, denominated Cephaz. It must, therefore, be more eligible to preserve the names in the version, and give their import in the margin, than conversely; unless we will say, that it is of more consequence to know the etymology of the names, than to be secured against mistaking the persons to whom they are appropriated. I shall only add, that, by a strange felicity in some tongues, both purposes are answered in the translation, as well as in the original. *Pierre*, in Fr. hits both senses exactly; and in La. and Itn. the affinity in the names is as great as between *πετρος* and *πετρα*, in Gr.

51. *Thou believest, πιστεύεις*. E. T. *Believest thou?* The words are capable of being translated either way. I prefer the more simple method of rendering, which is by affirmation, when neither the form of the sentence, nor any expression of surprise or emotion, lead us to consider it as an interrogation.

52. *Hereafter, ἀπ' ἀρτι*. There is nothing answering to this in the Vol. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions. The words are wanting in but one MS. of no great account.

CHAPTER II.

4. *Woman.* That this compellation was not, in those days, accounted disrespectful, has been fully evinced by critics from the best authorities. We find in this Gospel (ch. xix. 26.) our Lord addressing his mother by this title on a very moving occasion, on which he showed her the most tender affection and regard.

² *What hast thou to do with me?* Mt. viii. 29. N. It was no doubt our Lord's intention, in these words, gently to suggest that, in what concerned his office, earthly parents had no authority over him. In other things, he had been subject to them. Some translators have been rather over-solicitous to accommodate the expression to modern forms of civility. The An. *Leave that affair to me; is not that my concern?* Hey. *What is there between me and you?* This, I suppose, has been thought a softer expression of the sense than that which is given in the E. T. It is certainly more obscure, and does not suit our idiom. But it is a literal version of the phrase, by which the Fr. translators render our Lord's expression—*Qu' y a-t-il entre vous et moi?* Wes. *What is it to me and thee?* This, at first sight, appears preferable to the rest, because the most literal version. But, as Bishop Pearce well observes, had that been the Evangelist's meaning, he would have written *τι προς εμε και σε*; as in ch. xxi. 23. *τι προς σε*; *what is that to thee?* and, Mt. xxvii. 4. *τι προς ημας*; *what is that to us?* Let me add, that *τι εμοι και σοι*, as it is elliptic, is evidently a proverbial or idiomatic expression. Now, the meaning of such is always collected from the customary application of the words taken together, and not from combining the significations of the words taken severally. The common version suits the phrase in every place where it occurs—Wesley's does not; accordingly, in all other places, he renders it differently. Another reason against this manner is, because the sense conveyed by it is a worse sense, and not suitable to the spirit of our Lord's instructions. 'What is it to us, that they want wine? That concerns them only; let them see to it.' This way of talking appears rather selfish, and does not savour of that tender sympathy which

our religion so warmly recommends, whereby the interests and the concerns of others, their joys and their sorrows, are made our own.

6. *Baths, μετρητας.* E. T. *Firkins.* As to the impropriety of introducing into a version of Scripture the name of a vessel so modern as *firkin*, see Diss. VIII. P. I. § 9, &c. I have preferred here the Heb. measure, *bath*, as the common standard used in reckoning the capacity of their vessels; especially as I find the Heb. word בַּת rendered *μετρητης*, in the Sep. 2 Chron. iv. 5. I acknowledge, at the same time, that this evidence is not decisive; but I have not found any thing better, in support of a different opinion. The Seventy, indeed, have, in 1 Kings, xviii. 32. rendered בַּת *seah*, which was equal to one third of the *bath*, in the same manner; but, as the words *seah* and *ephah* were, with the Hebrews, peculiarly the names of dry measures, and never applied to liquids, we cannot have recourse to that passage for the interpretation of an expression relating solely to liquors. Some think that, as *μετρητης* was also the name of an Attic measure, the Evangelist (most of whose readers were probably Greeks) must have referred to it, as best known in that country. There are other suppositions made; but hardly any thing more than conjecture has been advanced in favour of any of them. It ought not to be dissembled, that, in most of the explanations which have been given of the passage, the quantity of liquor appears so great, as to reflect an improbability on the interpretation. I shall only say, that the E. T. is more liable to this objection than the present version. The *firkin* contains nine gallons; the *bath* is commonly rated at seven and a half, some say but four and a half; in which case the amount of the whole, as represented here, is but half of what the E. T. makes it. The quantity thus reduced, will not, perhaps, be thought so enormous, when we consider, first, the length of time, commonly a week, spent in feasting on such occasions (of which time, possibly, one half was not yet over), and the great concourse of people which they were wont to assemble.

² *For the Jewish rites of cleansing, κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων.* E. T. *After the manner of the purifying of the Jews.* This expression is rather obscure and indefinite. There can be

no doubt that, in such cases as the present, *κατα* is equivalent to *εις*, and denotes the end or purpose. So the Sy. interpreter has understood it.

10. *When the guests have drunk largely, όταν μεθύσωσι.* Vul. *Cum inebriati fuerint.* The Gr. word, frequently in Scripture, and sometimes in other writings, denotes no more than to *drink freely*, but not to intoxication.

14. *Cattle, βοας.* E. T. *Oxen.* *Bovs* in Gr. in like manner as *bos* in La. is the name of the species, and therefore of the common gender. It includes alike *bulls, cows, and oxen.* Thus, Gen. xli. 2, 3, the *kine* in Pharaoh's dream are termed *βοες* by the Seventy—*ἑπτα βοες καλαι—αλλαι ἑπτα βοες αισχροαι*—and in the Vul. they are named *boves*; but no person who understands Eng. would call them *oxen.* And though a herd may sometimes be so denominated, because the *oxen* make the greater part, it could never, with propriety, be used of cattle amongst which there was not even a single *ox.* Let it be observed, that the merchandize, which was carried on in the outermost court of the temple, a very unsuitable place, without doubt, was under the pretext of being necessary for the accommodation of the worshippers, that they might be supplied with the victims requisite for the altar; and, where payments in money were necessary, that, in exchange for the foreign coin they may have brought from their respective places of abode, they might be furnished with such as the law and custom required. Now, by the law of Moses, no mutilated beast, and consequently no *ox,* could be offered in sacrifice to God. Yet all the English translators I have seen, render *βοας* here *oxen.* In like manner, all the Fr. translators I am acquainted with, except Beau. who says, *des taureaux,* fall into the same mistake, rendering the word *des bæufs.*

20. *Forty and six years was this temple in building. τεσσαρακοντα και ἑξ ετεσιν ωκοδομηθη ὁ ναος οὗτος.* Dod. Hey. and Wor. say *hath been,* instead of *was,* proceeding on the supposition, that those who made this reply alluded to the additional buildings which the temple had received, and which had been begun by Herod, and continued by those who succeeded him in the government of Judea, to the time then present. But let it be observed, that the Jews never did, nor do, to this day, speak of more than

two temples possessed by their fathers ; the first built by Solomon, the second by Zerubbabel. The great additions made by Herod, were considered as intended only for decorating and repairing the edifice, not for rebuilding it ; for, in fact, Zerubbabel's temple had not then been destroyed. Nor need we, I think, puzzle ourselves to make out exactly the *forty-six years* spoken of. Those men were evidently in the humour of exaggerating, in order to represent to the people as absurd, what they had immediately heard advanced by our Lord. In this disposition, we may believe, they would not hesitate to include the years in which the work was interrupted, among the years employed in building.

22. *That he had said this, ὅτι τουτο ελεγεν.* In the common editions, *αυτοις*, *to them*, is added. But this word is wanting in a very great number of MSS. amongst which are several of the highest account. It is not in some of the best editions, nor in the following versions : the Vul. either of the Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. Ger. Tigurine, old Belgic. It has not been admitted by the best critics, ancient or modern.

² *They understood the Scripture and the word, πιστευσαν τη γραφη και τω λογω.* E. T. *They believed the Scripture and the word.* Πιστευειν, in the sacred writers, sometimes signifies, not so much *to believe*, as *to apprehend aright*. In this sense, it is once and again employed by this writer in particular. It is not insinuated here, that the disciples did not, before this time, *believe* the Scripture, or their Master's word ; but that they did not, till now, *rightly apprehend* the meaning of either, in relation to this subject. Another instance of this application of the verb πιστευω, we have, ch. iii. 12.

24. *Because he knew them all ; Δια το αυτον γνωσκειν παντας.* The Gr. expression is an apt example of ambiguous construction, for it is equally capable of being rendered *because they all knew him*. Yet interpreters, if I mistake not, have been unanimous in rendering it in the former way. This unanimity is itself a presumption in favour of that way ; but when to this is added the scope of the context, it is rendered indubitable. We can easily understand how a man's knowledge of some persons should hinder him from trusting them, but not how he should be hindered by their knowledge of him. Besides, the

words in the following verse, show that it is solely of our Lord's penetration into the characters of men, that the Evangelist is speaking.

CHAPTER III.

3. *Unless a man be born again, εαν μη τις γεννηθε ανωθεν.* Hey. *Unless a man be born from above.* The word, *ανωθεν* will, no doubt, admit either interpretation. But that the common version is here preferable, is evident from the answer given by Nicodemus, which shows, that he understood it no otherwise than as a second birth. And let it be observed, that, in the Cha. language, spoken by our Lord, there is not the same ambiguity which we find here in the Gr. The word occurs in this sense, Gal. iv. 9. The oldest versions concur in this interpretation. Vul. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit denuo.* With this, Cas. and Be. perfectly agree in sense. Er. indeed, says, *Nisi quis natus fuerit e supernis.* In this he is followed, as usual, by the translator of Zu. The Sy. is conformable to the Vul. So are also the Ger. the Itn. and all the Fr. versions, Romish, and Protestant. All the Eng. translators also, except Hey. render the words in the same manner.

² *He cannot discern the reign of God, ου δυναται ιδειν την βασιλειαν του Θεου.* E. T. *He cannot see the kingdom of God.* The common explanation that is given of the word *see*, in this passage, is *enjoy, share in.* Accordingly, it is considered as synonymous with *enter*, verse 5. Though I admit, in a great measure, the truth of this exposition, I do not think it comprehends the whole of what the words imply. It is true, that *to see*, often denotes *to enjoy*, or *to suffer*, as suits the nature of the object seen. Thus, *to see death*, is used for *to die*; *to see life*, for *to live*; *to see good days*, for *to enjoy good days*; and *to see corruption*, for *to suffer corruption.* But this sense of the word *seeing*, is limited to a very few phrases, of which those now mentioned are the chief. I have not however, found an example, setting this passage aside as questionable, of *ιδειν βασιλειαν*, for *enjoying a kingdom*, or partaking therein. Let it be observed further, that the form of the expression is not that used in threatening, which is always by the future, or by some

periphrasis of like import. Thus, as in the same chapter, verse 36. *ουκ οψεται ζωην* is denounced as a threat, the expression would probably have been here, had that been the scope, *ουκ οψεται την βασιλειαν του Θεου*. Whereas, the verb *δυναμαι*, with the negative particle, denotes, I imagine, an unfitness or incapacity in regard to the action or enjoyment mentioned. I understand, therefore, the word *ιδειν* to imply here, what it often implies, *to perceive, to discern*, not by the bodily organ, but by the eye of the mind. *To see*, for *to conceive, to understand*, is a metaphor familiar to all classes of people, and to be found in every language. The import, therefore, in my apprehension, is this: ‘The man who is not regenerated, or born again of water and spirit, is not in a capacity of perceiving the reign of God, though it were commenced. Though the kingdom of the saints on the earth were already established, the unregenerate would not discern it, because it is a spiritual, not a worldly kingdom, and capable of being no otherwise than spiritually discerned. And as the kingdom itself would remain unknown to him, he could not share in the blessings enjoyed by the subjects of it.’ This last clause appears to be the import of that expression, verse 5th, *he cannot enter the kingdom of God*. The two declarations, therefore, are not synonymous, but related; and the latter is consequent upon the former. The same sentiment occurs, 1 Cor. ii. 14. So far I agree with the common exposition, that, *to see*, means here *to enjoy*; for a great part of the enjoyment of those born of the spirit, consists, doubtless, in their spiritual discernment of things divine, or results from it. Let it be observed further, that the sense here given to the words makes the connexion and pertinency of the whole discourse much clearer. It is represented as our Lord’s answer to what Nicodemus had said to him. Now, though I acknowledge that the verb *αποκρινεσθαι* does not in the N. T. always imply strictly what the verb *to answer* implies with us (it being frequently used, agreeably to the Heb. idiom, of one who begins a conversation,) yet when it is preceded by the words of a different speaker, which though not a question, seem to require some notice, we shall not often err in rendering *to answer*. Such a case is the present. Nicodemus had acquainted our Lord what, in brief, his faith was concerning him, and the foundation on which it was built. His faith was, that Jesus was a teacher

whom God had specially commissioned, in other words a Prophet; and his reason for thinking so, was the miracles which he performed. This, we may rest assured, from what he says when evidently disposed to say the most he could, was the sum of his belief at that time concerning Jesus. No mention is made of the Messiah, or of his reign upon the earth. It is in reference to this defect, in the words of Nicodemus, partly, as it were, to account for his silence on this article, and partly to point out to him the proper source of this knowledge, that our Lord answers, by observing that, unless a man be enlightend by the spirit, or born anew, not to the light of this world, but to that of the heavenly, he cannot discern either the signs of the Messiah, or the nature of his government. For let it be observed, that Nicodemus, though more candid than any Jew of his rank at that time, and willing to weigh, impartially, the evidence of a divine mission, even in one who was detested by the ruling powers; was not altogether superior to those prejudices concerning the secular kingdom of the Messiah, which seem to have been universal among the Jews of that age. It is a very fine, and, at the same time, a very just observation of Cyril, that our Lord's reprehensions, in this conversation, in some respects more severe than ordinary, are to be understood as directed, not so much against Nicodemus, as against the guides and instructors of the age, the class to which Nicodemus belonged. Augustine is of opinion, that it was necessary thus to humble the spiritual pride of the Pharisee, the conceited superiority to the vulgar in things sacred, which is the greatest obstruction to divine knowledge; that he might be prepared for receiving, with all humility, the illumination of the spirit.

5. *Unless a man be born of water and spirit, εαν μη τις γεννηθη εξ υδατος και πνευματος.* Vul. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto.* For neither of these variations in the Vul. *renatus* for *natus*, and *sancto* added to *spiritu*, do we find any authority from MSS. or (if we except the Sax.) from versions.

² It may be proper to observe, in passing, that though our Lord, in this account of regeneration, joins *water* and *spirit* together, he does not, in contrasting it with natural generation, verse 6th, mention *the water* at all, but opposes simply *the spirit* to *the flesh*, as the original principles, if I may so express myself, of those different sorts of birth. Again, in what he says.

verse 8th, of the manner wherein this change is effected, the regenerate are distinguished solely by the words *born of the spirit*.

8. *The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but knowest not whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so it is with every one who is born of the spirit*—Το πνευμα ὁπε θελει πνει, και την φωνην αυτε ακεις, αλλ' εκ οιδας ποθεν ερχεται και πε ὑπαγει' ἕτως εσι πας ὁ γεγεννημενος εκ τε πνευματος. Vul. Fr. Zu. *Spiritus, ubi vult, spirat, et vocem ejus audis, sed nescis unde veniat aut quo vadat: sic est omnis qui natus est ex spiritu*. It is worthy of remark, that as, in the Gr. and in the Vul. the same word, in this passage, signifies both *wind* and *spirit*, the illustration is expressed with more energy than it is possible to give it in those languages which do not admit the same ambiguity. The Sy. does admit it, and is an exact version of the words, in the full extent they have in the original. As, in most modern tongues, it is necessary to recur to different words for explaining the same term, in the beginning of the verse and in the end, this gives a degree of obscurity, and an appearance of incoherency, to the version, which the original has not. The Fr. translators from the Vul. as Si. Sa. and P. R. have employed the word *l'esprit* in both places. *L'esprit souffle ou il veut, et vous entendez bien sa voix*. This sounds oddly in our ears. It would be still worse to render *πνευμα*, *wind*, in both places. But to preserve the similitude, and express the sense with sufficient perspicuity, in a modern language, would require more of the manner of paraphrase, than is thought sufferable in a translator. As this manner, however, is not offensive in a note, I shall give what appears to me the purport of verses 7th and 8th. 'Nor is there,' as if he had said, 'any thing in this, either absurd, or unintelligible. The 'wind, which, in Hebrew, is expressed by the same word as spirit, shall serve for an example. It is invisible; we hear the 'noise it makes, but cannot discover what occasions its rise or its 'fall. It is known to us solely by its effects. Just so it is with 'this second birth. The spirit himself, the great agent, is invisible, his manner of operating is beyond our discovery; but the 'reality of his operation is perceived by the effects produced on 'the disposition and life of the regenerate.'

10. *The teacher of Israel, ὁ διδασκαλος τε Ισραηλ. E. T. A*

master of Israel. The article here is remarkable; the more so, because there does not appear to be a single Gr. copy which omits it. As a member of the sanhedrim, Nicodemus had a superintendency in what concerned religious instruction, and might, on that account, have been called *a teacher of Israel*; but it is probably to intimate to us a distinguished fame for abilities in this respect, that he is styled, by way of eminence, ὁ διδασκαλος. It appears so particular, that it ought not to be overlooked by the translator. Be. after Er. has properly distinguished it in La. which has not articles, by the pronoun, *magister ille Israelis.* The only other version I know, wherein attention has been paid to the article in this place, is Diodati's who says, *il dottore d' Israel.* The reproof conveyed in this verse is thought to have an allusion to certain figures of speech, pretty similar to those used on this occasion by our Lord, and not unfrequent among the rabbies, who considered the baptism of proselytes as a new birth. To this sort of language, therefore, it might be thought extraordinary that Nicodemus should be so much a stranger. I think, however, that our Lord's censure rather relates to his being so entirely unacquainted with that effusion of the spirit which would take place under the Messiah, and which had been so clearly foretold by the Prophets.

12. *If ye understood not.* Ch. ii. 22. ² N.

13. *Whose abode is heaven,* ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. E. T. *Which is in heaven.* Two MSS. of no name, read ἐκ τῆς οὐρανε. But as this reading is supported by no ancient author or translator, it has no authority. The common reading is not unsuitable to the style of the writer. Ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς πατρὸς, ch. i. 18. is a similar expression. Both are intended to denote, rather what is habitual and characteristic of the person, than what obtains at a particular instant. By the expression, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς πατρὸς, is meant, not only 'who is the special object of the father's love,' but 'who is admitted to his most secret counsels.' By ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, is meant, 'whose abode, whose residence, 'whose home is there.' This is agreeable, in import, to the interpretation given by Nonnus:

— Ὅς ἀξεροεντι μελαθρῷ
Πατρῶν σδας ἐχῶν, αἰωνίος αἰθερα ναιει.

14. *As Moses placed on high the serpent, καθως Μωσης ὑψωσε τον οφιν.* E. T. *As Moses lifted up the serpent.* Unless we knew the story referred to, which is related, Numb. xxi. we should not rightly understand the meaning of the expression used in the E. T. *To lift up a serpent,* implies no more than to take it off the ground, and is consequently far from expressing the import of the Gr. word ὑψωσε.

20, 21. In these two concluding verses of this conversation, our Saviour glances, as it were in passing, at the impropriety of Nicodemus' conduct in coming to consult him in the silence of the night, as one conscious of doing what he ought to be ashamed of, not as one who acted in obedience to the call of duty. To this the attention of a conscientious man would be more strongly awakened, as the preferring of darkness to light is declared to be the ground of the condemnation of infidels.

21. *That it may be manifest that his actions are agreeable to God, ἵνα γανερωθη αυτε τα εργα, ὅτι εν Θεω εσιν ειργασμενα.* E. T. *That his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.* Vul. *Ut manifestentur opera ejus quia in Deo sunt facta.* Instead of *in Deo*, Er. says, *per Deum*, Zu. *cum Deo*, and Cas. *divinitus*. Be. has hit the sense better, rendering it *secundum Deum*. Gro. justly observes, that in such cases *εν* is used for *κατα*, and gives for an example *εν Κυριω*, 1 Cor. vii. 39. In this Be. has been followed by Dio. who says *secondo Iddio*, the G. E. *according to God*, and the G. F. *selon Dieu*. In the same manner, both L. Cl. and Beau. translate the words. I may also add, Si. who, though not chargeable with partiality to Be. and though translating from the Vul. has here adopted the method of the Genevese interpreter, and rendered it *selon Dieu*. I have expressed the same sense with as much plainness as our idiom will admit.

25. *John's disciples had a dispute with a Jew, εγενετο ζητησις εκ των μαθητων Ιωαννης μετα Ιεδαιων.* E. T. *There arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews.* There is no ellipsis here, *εκ* being used for *απο*. Though the common editions read *Ιεδαιων*, the greater number of MSS. amongst which are some of the most valuable, some ancient expositors also and critics, read *Ιεδαιε* in the singular. With this agree both the Sy.

versions. To this reading also Nonnus the Gr. versifier and paraphrast, who commonly keeps pretty close to the sense, has also given his sanction:

*Εἰς δε τις ἀμφὶ καθαρῆς
Ἐπλετο μυσιπολοισιν Ἰωάννης μαθηταῖς
Ἐβραῖε μετὰ φωτός.*

Add to these some of our best modern critics, as Gro. Cocceius, Ham. Mill, and Wet.

² *About purification, περὶ καθαρῆς*: that is, as appears from the sequel, about baptisms and other legal ablutions.

29. *The bridegroom is he who hath the bride, ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην, νύμφιός ἐστιν.* E. T. *He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.* As the manifest intention here is to point out the distinction between Jesus the bridegroom and John his friend, the arrangement I have given the words is more suited to the Eng. idiom. The other way appears to us an inversion of the natural order, and is consequently less perspicuous.

32. *Yet his testimony is not received.* This, compared with the clause, *He who receiveth his testimony*, which immediately follows, is a strong evidence that the words of Scripture ought not to be more rigidly interpreted, than the ordinary style of dialogue; wherein such hyperboles as *all* for *many*, and *none* for *few*, are quite familiar.

33. *Voucheth the veracity of God, ἐσφραγισεν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστιν.* E. T. *Hath set to his seal that God is true.* As sealing was employed for vouching the authenticity of writs, *to seal* came, by a natural and easy transition, to signify *to vouch*, *to attest*. Our acceptance of God's message by his Son, through an unshaken faith, vouches, on our part, the faithfulness of God, and the truth of his promises.

34. *For he whom God hath commissioned, relateth God's own words. Ὁν γὰρ ἀπεξεῖλεν ὁ Θεὸς, τὰ ῥήματα τε Θεοῦ λαλεῖ.* There is the same kind of ambiguity here which was remarked in ch. ii. 24. The version may be, *God's own words relate whom God hath commissioned.* Here also translators appear unanimous in preferring the former version, which is likewise more agreeable to the

usual application of the terms. It is more natural to represent a person as speaking words, than words as speaking a person. It is, besides, favoured by the connection. Wa. seems to have declared himself an exception from the unanimity in both cases, but without assigning a reason. See his New Translation.

CHAPTER IV.

1. *Jesus, ὁ Κύριος.* E. T. *The Lord.* But the Cam. and ten other MSS. read ὁ Ἰησους. It is thus read also in the Vul. both the Sy. the Cop. the Arm. the Ara. and the Sax. versions. Chr. has read so, and it is also in some printed editions. As this difference in reading makes not the smallest change in the sense, but a change to the better in the composition of the sentence, I thought the above mentioned authority sufficient for adopting it. The way in which the sentence runs in the E. T. would naturally lead the reader to think that one person is meant by *the Lord*, and another by *Jesus*. *When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made*—Several of the authorities aforesaid drop Ἰησους in the latter part of the verse. I am surprised that this has been overlooked by Wet.

5. *Near the heritage, πλησιον τς χωρις.* E. T. *Near to the parcel of ground.* This application of the word *parcel* is very unusual. The word *χωριον* means an estate in land; and as the estate here spoken of was given by the Patriarch to his son Joseph, to be possessed by him and his posterity, it is properly denominated *heritage*, agreeably to what we are told, Josh. xxi. 32. It is so rendered into Fr. by Beau. Sa. P. R. and Si.

9. *For the Jews have no friendly intercourse with the Samaritans, ε γαρ συγχρωνται Ιουδαιοι Σαμαρειταις.* E. T. *For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.* That the word *dealings* implies too much to suit the sense of this passage, is manifest from the preceding verse, where we are told that the disciples were gone into the Samaritan city Sychar to buy food. The verb *συγχραμαι* is one of those called *ἀπαξ λεγομενα*: it does not occur in any other place of the N. T. or in the Sep. The Pharisees were, in their traditions, nice distinguishers. Buying and selling with Samaritans was permitted, because that was considered as an intercourse

merely of interest or conveniency; borrowing and lending, much more asking or accepting any favour, was prohibited; because that was regarded as an intercourse of friendship, which they thought impious to maintain with those whom they looked upon as the enemies of God.

10. *The bounty of God, την δωρεαν τε Θεου.* E. T. *The gift of God.* The word *δωρεα* means not only a particular gift, but that disposition of mind from which the gift arises, *bounty, liberality, goodness.* In this sense it is sometimes used by the Apostle Paul, as Eph. iii. 7. iv. 7. Most translators, not attending to this, have rendered these verses by tautologies and indefinite expressions, to the great hurt of perspicuity. The meaning of the word is, I imagine, the same in Heb. vi. 4. But the plainest example of this acceptation we have in the Apocryphal book of Wisdom, ch. xvi. 25. where the care of Providence in supporting every living thing, is, in an address to God, called *ἡ παντοτροφος σε δωρεα*, literally, in Eng. *thy all-nourishing bounty.* This meaning appears also more pertinent and emphatical in the passage under consideration. A particular gift cannot be understood as referred to, when there is nothing in the context to suggest it. But there seems to be intended here a contrast between the munificence of God, which extends to those of all regions and denominations upon the earth, and the contracted spirit of man, who is ingenious in devising pretexts for confining the divine liberality to as few objects as possible. To this train of sentiment the preceding words naturally lead. The woman had expressed her astonishment that a Jew could ask even so small a favour as a draught of water from a Samaritan. Jesus tells her, that if she had considered more the bounty of the universal Parent, from which none are excluded by the distinction of Jew, Samaritan, or Heathen, than maxims founded in the malignity of man, and if she had known the character of him who talked with her, she might have asked successfully a gift infinitely more important.

^a *Living water, ἕδωο ζων.* It may surprise an English reader, unacquainted with the Oriental idiom, that this woman, who appears, by the sequel, to have totally misunderstood our Lord, did not ask what he meant by *living water*, but proceeded on the supposition that she understood him perfectly, and only did not conceive how, without some vessel for drawing and containing

that water, he could provide her with it to drink. The truth is, the expression is ambiguous. In the most familiar acceptation, *living water* meant no more than running water. In this sense the water of springs and rivers would be denominated *living*, as that of cisterns and lakes would be called *dead*, because motionless. Thus, Gen. xxvi. 19. we are told that Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water. It is *living water* both in the Heb. and in the Gr. as marked on the margin of our Bibles. Thus also, Lev. xiv. 5. what is rendered *running water* in the Eng. Bible, is in both these languages *living water*. Nay, this use was not unknown to the Latins, as may be proved from Virgil and Ovid. In this passage, however, our Lord uses the expression in the more sublime sense for divine teaching, but was mistaken by the woman as using it in the popular acceptation.

11. *Thou hast no bucket, στε αντλημα εχεις.* E. T. *Thou hast nothing to draw with.* Αντλημα, from αντλεω, *haurio* is *haustum*, *situla*, *vas ad hauriendum*; which is the definition of a *bucket*. So Dod. also renders the word.

20. *This mountain*, to wit, Gerizim, at the foot of which Sychar was built, and on which the Samaritans had formerly erected a temple, though not then remaining. For they pretended that this was the place where the Patriarchs had offered sacrifice, and which God himself had set apart as the only place consecrated for the performance of the most solemn and public ceremonies of their religion. In support of this their opinion they quote some passages from the Pentateuch (the only part of Scripture which they acknowledge), particularly Deut. xxvii. 4. where, instead of Ebal, as it is in all the Jewish copies of the Heb. Scriptures commonly received, the Samaritan copies of the same scriptures read Gerizim.

22. *Ye worship what ye know not; we worship what we know—* υμεις προσκυνειτε ο εκ οιδατε ημεις προσκυνεμεν ο οιδαμεν. E. T. *Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship.* There is apparently no difference between these two versions, except that the first keeps closer to the arrangement of the Gr. But in effect this makes here a considerable difference. The

same thought is conveyed in both; but in the former with the simplicity of the original, wherein great plainness is used, but nothing that savours of passion; whereas it is impossible to read the latter without perceiving much of the manner of a contemptuous reproach, and what would have therefore more befitted the mouth of a Pharisee than of our Lord. So much in language depends often on a very small circumstance. *What ye know not*, contrasted to *what we know*, implies, in the Heb. idiom, not total ignorance, but inferior knowledge. Thus *love* and *hatred* are opposed (see L. xiv. 26), to denote merely greater and less love. Now, if the writings of the Prophets were of importance for conveying the knowledge of the perfections and will of God, the Samaritans, who rejected all those writings (receiving only for canonical, the five books of Moses), must, on this head, have been more ignorant than the Jews, which is all that our Saviour's words imply.

² *Salvation is from the Jews*.—The Saviour or the Messiah must be of that nation, of the tribe of Judah, and posterity of David.

25. *I know that the Messiah cometh; (that is, the Christ.)* Οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἐρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. E. T. *I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ.* In the manner wherein the last clause, *which is called Christ*, is here expressed, it appears to have been spoken by the woman: yet, it is manifest that that could not have been the case. Our Lord and the woman spoke a dialect of the Chaldee, at that time the language of the country, and in the N. T. called Hebrew, wherein *Messiah* was the proper term, and consequently needed not to be explained to either into Greek, which they were not speaking, and which was a foreign language to both. But it was very proper for the Evangelist, who wrote in Greek, and in the midst of those who did not understand Chaldee, when introducing an Oriental term, to explain it for the sake of his Gr. readers. Ch. i. 43. N.

27. *That he talked with a woman, ὅτι μετὰ γυναῖκος ἐλάλει.* E. T. *That he talked with the woman.* The learned reader will observe, that *γυναῖκος* here has no article, and is consequently better rendered *a woman*. We need not be surprised that it should be matter of wonder to the disciples, that their Master was talking with *a woman*; for so great, at that time, was the pride of the learned, in that nation, that they imagined that to have a dialogue with such, on any serious and important matter,

did but ill suit the dignity and gravity which ought to be uniformly maintained by a rabbi, or doctor of their law. Admit that the passages in proof of this, produced by Lightfoot, from the Talmud and rabbinical writers, are unaccountable and stupid, as Dod. angrily calls them, they are sufficient evidence that such a sentiment, however unaccountable and stupid, prevailed among them. Now it is the fact, the prevalence of the sentiment, and not its reasonableness, with which the interpreter is concerned. Further, that the disciples were not, in any thing, superior to the prejudices of the age, is manifest from the whole of their history. That the woman was a Samaritan, doubtless, made the thing more astonishing.

29. *Is this the Messiah?* μητι ουτος εστιν ο Χριστος; E. T. *Is not this the Christ?* see Mt. xii. 23. N. The reason given by Knatchbull for preferring the common version, is far from being decisive. Though the woman's opinion had been (as probably it was) that our Lord was the Messiah: still it was more becoming in her to put the question simply to the men of the city, *Is this the Messiah?* than in the other way, *Is not this the Messiah?* which plainly suggested her own opinion, before she heard their's. The internal evidence, arising from the scope of the passage is therefore, to say the least, as favourable to this interpretation as to the other; and the external evidence arising from use, which in this case ought to preponderate, is entirely in its favour.

42. *The Messiah, ο Χριστος.* This is wanting in two or three MSS. and in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Ethiop. and Sax. versions.

44. [*But not to Nazareth*]. There is a probability that something to this purpose has been very early omitted in transcribing. The casual conjunction γαρ, which introduces the verse, shows that it contains the reason of what had immediately preceded. As, however, in regard to the clause itself, we have nothing more than conjecture from the scope of the place, and the known historical facts, I have enclosed in crotchets, the words which I thought it necessary to supply.—By his *country*, πατρις, is commonly meant *Nazareth*, supposed to be his native city, and in fact the place of his early residence.

46. *Officer of the court, βασιλικος.* E. T. *Nobleman.* The

Sy. and Ara. render it a *servant*, or *minister of the king*; that is, of Herod the tetrarch of Galilee, commonly in that country (whose language did not supply words corresponding to all the distinctions made by the Greeks) styled *king*. The Vul. says *regulus*; but in the judgment of the best critics, the word then implied no more than *regius*, and denoted in general an eminent officer of the court. The Eng. word *nobleman* conveys the notion of hereditary rank and certain dignities, to which there was nothing in Palestine, or even in Syria, that corresponded. Yet all the late Eng. versions have in this implicitly followed the common translation; and it is remarkable, that not one of the foreign versions I have seen, has adopted a term answering to that Eng. word. Diss. VII. P. I. § 5. 6.

54. *This second miracle Jesus performed after returning from Judea to Galilee, τουτο παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ο Ιησους, ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν.* E. T. *This is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee.* The words of the historian do not necessarily imply more than that this, which was the second of our Lord's miracles in that country, was performed after returning from Judea to Galilee; the first miracle being understood to be that of turning water into wine at the marriage in Cana. From the way in which it is expressed in the common version, we should conclude that both miracles were after the return to Galilee, which is not agreeable to the fact as related in the preceding part of this history. The word *παλιν*, whatever be the interpretation, must be placed differently. I arrange the words in this manner: *Τουτο δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ο Ιησους, παλιν ελθων εκ της Ιουδαιας εις την Γαλιλαιαν.* It is agreeable to a rule of universal grammar, that in construing a sentence, the adverbs be joined to the verbs or the participles. There are here but two of these, *εποιησεν* and *ελθων*. To join *παλιν* to the former would be absurd, because it would represent the same individual miracle as twice performed. It must, by consequence, be joined to the latter.

CHAPTER V.

2. *There is, εστι.* The Sy. seems to have read η, as it is rendered in that version in the past. Cyril, Chr. and The. favour this reading, so does Nonnus. If tolerably supported, it would be accounted preferable, as this gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem.

² *Nigh the sheep-gate, επι τη προβατικη.* E. T. *By the sheep-market.* This clause is omitted in the Sy. and Sax. versions. The learned reader will observe that there is nothing in the Gr. which answers to either *gate* or *market*; but the word used, being an adjective, requires some such addition to complete the sense. Now, we have good evidence, that one of the gates of Jerusalem was called *the sheep-gate*. See Nehem. iii. 1. & 32. xii. 39. But we have no evidence that any place there was called *the sheep-market*. Be. renders the words *ad portam pecuariam*; Dio. *presso della porta delle pecore*; P. R. Beau. L. Cl. *près de la porte des brebis*; in Eng. the An. Hey. and Wes. *by the sheep-gate*. The Vul. seems to have read differently. The preposition επι is omitted, and the words προβατικη κολυμβηθρα are read as adjective and substantive, in the nominative case, *est autem probatica piscina quæ cognominatur Hebraice Bethesda*. With this Cas. partly agrees and partly differs. He reads the preposition as in the Gr. and προβατικη κολυμβηθρα, as agreeing in the dative, *est autem Hierosolymis apud oviaricam piscinam ea quæ Hebraice Bethesda nuncupatur*. The reading in the Vul. is quite unsupported, and therefore not worthy of regard. Cas. assigns two reasons for his interpretation. One is, that προβατικη would be without a substantive. Now it is a known idiom in Gr. to employ an adjective alone, when the substantive to be supplied is easily suggested by the import of the adjective, or by frequent use. Thus the names of most arts and sciences in Gr. are the feminines of adjectives, whose meaning easily suggests the word understood. Μουσικη, for instance, ιατρικη, μαθηματικη, τεχνη being understood to each of the two former, and επιστημη to the last. The frequent conjunction of a particular substantive with a particular adjective, produces the same effect.

Now, if one of the gates of Jerusalem was ever called ἡ προβατικὴ πύλη, as we know from the O. T. that it was, nothing could be more natural in those who spoke Gr. than to drop πύλη as superfluous, and name it simply ἡ προβατικὴ. This would happen still more readily, if the adjective was in a manner appropriated to that single use. Now it is remarkable, that the adjective προβατικός occurs nowhere in the N. T. but in this passage; and never in the Old, but where mention is made of *the sheep-gate* of Jerusalem. Ἡμερὰ κυριακῆ occurs once in the N. T. and is properly rendered *the Lord's day* (Rev. i. 10). The frequent appropriation of this distinction to the first day of the week, and the custom arising thence, of conceiving ἡμερὰ as closely connected with κυριακῆ, brought people gradually to drop ἡμερὰ as unnecessary, being what the hearer's knowledge and habits would readily supply. In this manner κυριακῆ alone in Gr. and *dominica* in Lat. came to signify *the Lord's day*. Βασιλικός, in the former chapter, which signifies *an officer of the court*, is properly an adjective in the masculine, answering to *regius* in Lat. and *royal* in Eng. To make the expression complete, we must supply ἀνθρώπος. In like manner βασιλειον (L. VII. 25), the neuter gender of βασιλείος, an adjective of the same signification, has come to denote *a royal palace*. The word οἰκηγηριον, or some other neuter of the same import has been joined with it at first, but afterwards overlooked as useless. Take the following examples for a specimen from the Gospels, Mt. vi. 3, ἡ ἀριστερὰ, scilicet χεὶρ, *the left hand*, x. 42. ποτηριον ψυχροῦ, scilicet ὕδατος, *a cup of cold water*. L. i. 39. εἰς τὴν ὄρεινην, scilicet χώραν, *into the hill country*. J. xx. 12. ἐν λευκοῖς, scilicet ἱματίοις, *in white garments*. Castalio's other objection against the common rendering is, that it appropriates the name *Bethesda*, which signifies *the house of mercy*, improperly to *a pool* or bath, which cannot, in any sense, be denominated *a house*. I answer, first, that though *Beth*, the first part of the name *Bethesda*, denotes commonly *a house*; yet when such terms are compounded with others in forming a proper name, they ought not to be so strictly interpreted. The place to which Jacob first gave the name *Bethel*, that is, *the house of God*, Gen. xxviii. 10, &c. was evidently at the time a place in the open fields, where he had slept all night, with a stone for his pillow, and had the dream of the ladder. That there was then in the vicinity, or afterwards perhaps upon the spot, a city which was first called *Luz*, and

probably after the division of the country by Joshua, *Bethel*, in memory of what had there happened to the patriarch, is readily admitted. When *Beth* made part of the name of a city, there was a plain deviation from the primitive meaning of the word. Yet nothing was more common. *Bethlehem*, the city of David, denotes *the house of bread*. What was called by the Greeks *Heliopolis*, the city of the sun, was in Heb. *Bethshemesh*, the house of the sun. I answer, 2dly, That we ought not to confine the signification of *κολληθηθρα* to the water collected, but ought to consider it as including the covered walks, and all that had been built for the accommodation of those who came thither. In this extent the word *bath* is familiarly used by ourselves. I have preferred the name *bath* to *pool*, as more suitable to the purpose to which this water was appropriated.

4. Several MSS. to *αγγελος* add *κυριου*. Vul. *Angelus Domini*, followed by the Arm. and Sax. versions.

16. *And sought to kill him, και εξητουν αυτον αποκτειναι*. This clause is not in the Cam. and some other MSS. of note. It is wanting also in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions.

18. *By calling God peculiarly his Father, had equalled himself with God, πατερα ιδιον ελεγε τον Θεον, ισον εαυτον ποιων τω Θεω*. Vul. *Patrem suum dicebat Deum, æqualem se faciens Deo*. E. T. *Said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God*. On a little reflection it must be evident that the sense is, in both these versions, imperfectly expressed. For how could those men say that Jesus, by calling God his father, made himself equal with God? There must, therefore, be here something peculiar and energetic in the word *ιδιος*. The expression in most familiar use would have been *πατερα εαυτου*. And, though I am far from saying that there are not many cases in which either expression may be used indifferently, there are some in which *ιδιος* is more emphatical, and others in which it would not be strictly proper. Be.'s explanation of the word is very just; *suum, ιδιον, id est sibi proprium ac peculiarem*. In this view the import of the words is, that God is father to him in a sense wherein he is father to no other. Let it be observed, however, that if the scope of the context did not necessarily lead to this conclusion, I should not infer so much from the mere applica-

tion of the word *ιδιος*: for though this is strictly the import of the term, it is often, like many other words, employed with greater latitude. Perhaps on a superficial view, I shall be thought in this to concur with a writer who, in support of a favourite hypothesis, has thus explained the precept (1 Cor. vii. 2), *ἐκαστη τον ιδιον ανδρα εχετω*, "Let every married woman have the man appropriated to her exclusively of all other men upon earth." If, instead of men, he had said women, he would have hit the sense entirely, and suited the explanation here given of the word. As it stands, there is an indistinctness in the expression, which serves only to darken it. The exclusion of other *men* in this explanation, must satisfy every one that the words *the man appropriated to her*, are used, by what figure I know not, for *the man to whom she is appropriated*; for he is not at all *appropriated to her*, if he may have other wives; but she is manifestly *appropriated to him*, if she cannot have another husband. This strange confusion in the use of words, is frequent with that writer. Thus, a little after, "The word *ιδιος*," he says, "seems to denote such an appropriation of the husband to the wife; (who would not expect it to follow, *as that he could not have, or go to any other woman?* but hear himself,) "as that she could not have, or go to any other man." Now this shows merely the appropriation of the wife to the husband, but by no means the appropriation of the husband to the wife. *Ιδιος* is; by this account, made synonymous with *μονος*, so that *ιδιος ανηρ* means her only husband. By the same rule, in the parable of the compassionate Samaritan, who is said (L. x. 34.) to have set the wounded Jew *επι το ιδιον κτηνος*, we ought to render these words, not *on his own beast*, but *on his only beast*: or, to define it in this critic's own terms, the beast appropriated to him exclusively of all other beasts upon earth. And to give one other instance where we have in the E. T. (L. vi. 41), *but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye*, the words *εν τω ιδιω οφθαλμω* ought to be rendered *in thine only eye*. Let it be observed that the term *ιδιος* is always conceived as denoting the person or thing appropriated, not the proprietary. In this view *ιδιος* is opposed to *κοινος*; so that in strictness I have no title to call any thing *ιδιον* which I enjoy in common with others; that this is agreeable to scriptural usage, we learn from Acts iv. 32. *ουδε εις τι των υπαρχοντων ελεγεν ιδιον ειναι' αλλ' ην αυτοις απαντα κεινα*. *Neither said any of them, that ought of the things which he*

possessed was his own ; but they had all things common. If so, no woman can call any man *ιδιος ανηρ*, her own, whom she has for a husband in common with other women : for such a man, in regard to his wives, is *αυταις πασαις κοινος*, and consequently *μηδεμιας αυτων ιδιος*. To apply this to the controverted passage : the sense may be justly expressed by the periphrasis quoted from Beza, *unaqueque habeat virum sibi proprium ac peculiarem* ; in English, *Let every woman have the husband appropriated and peculiar to herself*. If the case had been reversed, and the apostle had said *εκαστος την ιδιαν γυναικα εχστω και εκαστη τον εαυτης ανδρα*, it might have been pleaded with some plausibility, that the woman was represented as the man's property, who has an exclusive right to her, whereas the man was mentioned merely as her husband. For my part, I acknowledge that, in such general precepts, the two phrases are commonly equivalent, that the marriage bond is reciprocal, and that if there has been here an intentional difference in applying those expressions, the Apostle must have judged it necessary from the circumstances of the times, to signify, in a more explicit manner, the appropriation of the husband to the wife, than that of the wife to the husband. From the corrupt customs that then prevailed among both Jews and Pagans, there must have been greater need to inculcate on Christian husbands than on Christian wives, that the marriage bond confined each of them to one, and that if the men challenged a property in their wives, it could be in no other sense admitted than in that wherein the women were entitled to challenge a property in their husbands. That author, therefore, has been exceedingly unlucky in urging the emphatical import of *ιδιος* in the precept above mentioned : for it is manifest that the emphasis, if allowed, must subvert his whole theory. His only resource, therefore, is that of those who, though they have overlooked this blunder in his reasoning, have so learnedly criticised his work, and who affirm, with truth, that such expressions are often used indiscriminately. In this way he may obtain a neutrality from a quarter otherwise hostile. That author thinks it remarkable, and, I own, I think so too, that it is always in the N. T. *ιδιος ανηρ*, and never *ιδια γυνη* ; nor can I give any account of a use so much in favour of the weaker sex, but what has been already suggested. There was no danger that any woman should think herself entitled to a plurality of husbands, a thing repugnant to the laws and customs of all nations ; but there was great danger

that there might be men who would claim a plurality of wives. This is the more worthy of notice in the writers of the N. T. as no such expression occurs so much as once in the version of the O. T. by the Seventy. It is there invariably *ανηρ αυτης* or *εαυτης*, never *ιδιος ανηρ*: for during that dispensation, it must be owned, things stood on a different footing. Nor could the obligations which married persons were, by positive law, brought under, be said to have been perfectly reciprocal; for the wife could not then claim the same exclusive property in her husband, as at present. But, to return from what may be thought a digression: though of consequence for ascertaining the import of the term, I have not rendered *πατερα ιδιον*, with most moderns, *his own father*, because the word *own* adds nothing to the import of the possessive *his*; it serves only to fix the attention on this circumstance. The adverb *peculiarly* seems much better adapted here to supply the defect.

20. *Which will astonish you, ινα υμεις θαυμαζητε.* Mt. i. 22. ²N.

22. *Having committed the power of judging entirely to the Son, αλλα την κρισιν πασαν δεδωκε τω υιω.* E. T. *But hath committed all judgment unto the Son.* There are two Greek words, *κρισις* and *κριμα*, which are commonly rendered *judgment*. They are not synonymous, though sometimes used indiscriminately. *Κρισις* expresses more properly the power and even act of judging, *judicatio*; *κριμα* the effect *judicium*, the sentence pronounced, or even the punishment inflicted. Our Eng. word *judgment* is too indefinite to convey distinctly our Lord's meaning in this place. It is the version rather of *κριμα* than of *κρισις*. The Fr. translators, L. Cl. Beau. P. R. Sa. Si. render *πασαν κρισιν*, *tout pouvoir de juger*.

27. *Because he is a son of man, οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστιν.* E. T. *Because he 'is the son of man.* It is observed by Markland, (Bowyer's Conjectures), that it is not here *ο υιος του ανθρωπου*, the humble appellation by which our Lord commonly distinguished himself, but simply *υιος ανθρωπου*, without any article, a common Hebraism, and still more common Syriasm, for a *man*, a human being. This phrase occurs in the same sense, Dan. vii. 13. and Rev. i. 13. and ought to be so rendered; but it occurs nowhere in the Gospels, except in this passage. None of the Eng. translations I have seen mark this distinction; but it has been attended to by some foreign translators. *Dio Inquanto egli è figliuol d'huomo.*

G. F. *Entant qu'il est fils de l'homme.* L. Cl. P. R. and Sa. say also *fils de l'homme*, without the article. Diss. V. P. IV. § 13. It will, perhaps, be asked, But what is the meaning of the clause here, *because he is a son of man?* In my judgment, the import may be expressed in this manner—'because it suits the ends of 'divine wisdom, that the Judge, as well as Saviour, of men, 'should himself be man.'

27, 28. *And hath given him even the judicial authority, because he is a son of man.* Wonder not at this, *και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτου και κρισιν ποιειν, οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστι; Μη θαυμαζετε τετο.* Four inconsiderable MSS. make a small difference in the pointing which alters the sense. They make a full stop at *ποιειν*, and removing the point at *εστι*, join the words *οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστι το μη θαυμαζετε τετο.* v. 28. Differences merely in pointing are comparatively modern, as all the oldest and best have no points. Both the Sy. versions adopt this manner, and seem also to have read *δε* after *οτι*. But these can give no support to a reading, which, in itself, is less natural than the common one.

31. *My testimony is not to be regarded, η μαρτυρια με εκ εσιν αληθης.* E. T. *My witness is not-true.* In every country where there are standing laws, and a regular constitution, there is what is called a forensic or juridical use of certain words, which differs considerably from familiar use. I observed something of this kind in regard to *δικαιος* (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.), which, in the style of the law, means *not guilty of the crime charged.* The like holds of the word *αληθης*, which, when used in reference to the procedure in judicatories, denotes, not what is in itself true, but what is *proved*, or is supported by legal proof. Thus, it is said, that a man's testimony of himself is not true. A man may certainly give a true testimony of himself; but in law it is not *evidence*, and is therefore held as *untrue*. This sense of the word *αληθης* often occurs in this Gospel. Now, as such peculiarities, in any tongue, have an awkward appearance when translated into another, I have thought it more eligible to convey the sense with as little circumlocution as possible. Hey. and Wes. say *valid*: but this term does not give the exact meaning.

35. *He was the lighted and shining lamp, εκεινος ην ο λυχνος ο καιομενος και γαινων.* E. T. *He was a burning and a shining*

light. Not only our translators, but the much greater number of modern translators, have entirely overlooked the article in this place. Yet the structure of the sentence, and the repetition of the article before the participle *καιομενος*, serve to draw our attention to it. It ought to be remembered, that John's ministry was of a peculiar character: that he was the single Prophet in whom the old dispensation had its completion, and by whom the new was introduced; that, therefore, until our Lord's ministry took place, John may justly be said to have been *the light* of that generation. Perhaps there is an allusion here to the expression in the Psalms, cxxxii. (or, as it is in the Gr. cxxxii.) 17. *ἠτοιμασα τῷ χοιτῶνι μου λυχνον*, and consequently an insinuation that this was *the lamp* which God had provided according to his promise. The only modern interpreters I know, who have added the article here, are Dio. in Itn. and Si. in Fr.

² *Lighted, καιομενον*. E. T. *Burning*. The verb *καιειν* signifies *to light, to kindle, to burn*. When it is construed with *λυχνος, λαμπας*, or any other such term, it is properly *to light*, and is, or may be, always so rendered. See Mt. v. 15. L. xii. 35. But some are of opinion, that the word *burning*, as coupled here with *shining*, is much more expressive; inasmuch as it superadds to knowledge an ardour, zeal, or good affection in the service of God; and are convinced, that the one epithet alludes to the attractive influence of John's example, and the other to the perspicuity of his instructions. To this most paraphrasts, as Clarke and Dod. seem to have attended. But I am not satisfied that, in the original, there is any allusion of this kind. A lamp is used, not for warming people, but for giving them light. To me, in the word *καιομενον*, there appears rather a suggestion of the divine illumination of the Baptist. The light which was kept always burning in the sanctuary, and which came originally from heaven, was, in the judgment of the rabbies, an emblem of the light of prophecy. To many of our Lord's hearers, therefore, the word *καιομενον* would not appear an insignificant epithet, but an apposite suggestion of the source whence John derived his doctrine.

37, 38. *Did ye never hear his voice, or see his form? Or have ye forgotten his declaration, that ye believe not him whom he hath commissioned? στε φωνην αυτου ακηκοατε ποποτε, στε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε. Και τον λογον αυτου εκ εχετε μενοντα εν υμιν' οτι ον απεξειλεν εκεινος, τωτω υμεις οπισθευετε.* E. T. *Ye have neither*

heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. The reader will observe, that the two clauses which are rendered in the E. T. as declarations, are in this version translated as questions. The difference in the original is only in the pointing. That they ought to be so read, we need not, in my opinion, stronger evidence, than that they throw much light upon the whole passage, which, read in the common way, is both dark and ill connected. See an excellent note on this passage from Mr. Turner of Wakefield (Priestley's Harmony, sect. xl.) Our Lord here refers them to the testimony given of him at his baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended on him in a visible form, and when God, with an audible voice, declared him to be his beloved son and our law-giver, whom we ought to hear and obey. What has chiefly contributed to mislead interpreters, in regard to the import of this sentence, is the resemblance which it bears to what is said, ch. i. 18. *Θεον εδεις εωρακε ποποτε, no one ever saw God*; and, ch. vi. 46. *ουχ' οτι τον πατερα τις εωρακε, not that any one hath seen the Father*. There is, however, a difference in the expressions; for it is not said here, *ουτε τον πατερα, but ουτε ειδος αυτου εωρακατε*. This, it may be thought, as it seems to ascribe a body to God, must be understood in the same way; for we are told, Deut. iv. 12. that, when the Lord spake to the people out of the fire, they saw no *similitude*. Of this they are again reminded, verse 15. But the word in the Sep. is, in both places, not *ειδος* but *ομοιωμα*, which, in scriptural use, appears to denote a figure so distinct and permanent, as that it may be represented in stone, wood, or metal. Now, though this is not to be attributed to God, the sacred writers do not scruple to call the visible symbol which God, on any occasion, employs for impressing men more strongly with a sense of his presence, *ειδος αυτου*, which (for want of a better term) I have rendered *his form*. Thus the Evangelist L. says, ch. iii. 22. in relating that signal transaction which is here alluded to, that the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus, *σωματικω ειδει, in a bodily form*. Thus, also the word *ειδος* is applied to the appearances which God made to men, under the Mosaic dispensation. His appearance in fire upon Mount Sinai, is called by the Seventy, Ex. xxiv. 17. *το ειδος της δοξης Κυριου*; in our Bible, *the sight of the glory of the Lord*; more properly, *the glorious form or appearance of the Lord*. In

like manner, the word *ειδος* is applied to the symbol of the divine presence, which the Israelites enjoyed in the wilderness, the *cloud* which covered the tabernacle in the day-time, and appeared as *fire* in the night, Num. ix. 15, 16. And, to mention but one other instance, the display which he made to Moses, when he conversed with him face to face, is, in the E. T. said to be *apparently*, Num. xii. 8; but in the Sept. *εν ειδει*, that is, *in a form* or *visible figure*. Thus, in the language of Scripture, there is a manifest difference between *seeing God*, which no man ever did, he being in himself a pure spirit, and *seeing his form*, *το ειδος αυτου*, the appearance which, at any time, in condescension to the weakness of his creatures, he pleases to assume. Another evidence, if necessary, might be brought to shew that there was no intention here to express the invisibility of the divine nature; and is as follows: the clause which appears to have been so much misunderstood, is coupled with this other, *υτε φωνεν αυτου ακεκοιτε ποιοιτε*. Can we imagine that the impossible would have been thus conjoined with what is commonly mentioned as a privilege often enjoyed by God's people, and to which their attention is required as a duty? For though we are expressly told, that *no man ever saw God*, it is nowhere said that no man ever heard his voice. Nay, in the very place above quoted, Dent. iv. 12. where we are informed that the people saw no *similitude*, *ομοιωματα*, it is particularly mentioned that they heard *the voice*. To conclude: there is the greater probability in the explanation which I have given of the words, as all the chief circumstances attending that memorable testimony at his baptism are exactly pointed out,—the miraculous voice from heaven, the descent of the Holy Spirit in a bodily form, and the declaration itself then given. Dr. Clarke seems to have had some apprehension of this meaning: for, though, in his paraphrase, he explains the words in the usual way, he, in a parenthesis, takes notice of the two striking circumstances, the voice and the form at our Lord's baptism. That what is called *his word*, or declaration, verse 38th, refers to the same thing, is evident: for, otherwise, it would coincide with the testimony of Scripture, which is not introduced till verse 39th.

39. *Ye search the Scriptures; ερευνατε τας γραφας.* E. T. *Search the Scriptures.* The words of the Evangelist may be interpreted either way, or even as an interrogation.—*Do ye search?*

The translator's only rule, in such cases, is the connection. To me it is evident, that nothing suits this so well as the indicative. All agree, that *ε θελετε ελθειν*, which is coupled to the former verb by the conjunction *και*, is an indicative. Yet this is hardly consistent with propriety, if *ερευνατε* be not. Besides, the whole reasoning is rendered weaker by the vulgar interpretation. It is entirely suitable to say, *Ye search, because ye think thereby to obtain*—Ye act thus, in conformity to a fixed opinion. But if the words be understood as a command, it is not a cogent argument. Search, because ye think, for men may be mistaken in their thoughts; but search, because ye can thereby obtain. In Sy. and La. the words have the same ambiguity as in Gr. In Fr. L. Cl. Beau. and P. R. render it, as here, by the indicative; and in Eng. the An. Dod. Hey. and Wor. It has been said, that the second person plural of the present of the indicative, beginning a sentence, and not preceded by the pronoun, is to be understood as a question. If it be not a question, the verb must be read imperatively. In contradiction to this, many clear examples from Scripture, have been produced by former expositors.

CHAPTER VI.

11. *To those who had lain down, τοις μαθηταις οἱ δε μαθηται τοις ανακειμενοις.* E. T. *To the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down.* The words *τοις μαθηταις οἱ δε μαθηται*, are wanting in a few MSS. of which the Al. is one. There is nothing answering to them in any of the following versions: the Vul. the two Sy. Go. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. and Ara. Nonnus omits them; so does Origen. I confess, that the principal reason for rejecting this clause, is the almost unanimous testimony of ancient versions against it. Several interpolations of little consequence have arisen from the indiscreet zeal of transcribers, in supplying what they thought deficient in one Gospel out of another. Of this, the present clause, taken from Mt. xiv. 19. appears to be an example.

22. In this and the two following verses, is contained a sentence more involved than any other in this Gospel. Indeed, it is so unlike the composition of this Evangelist, as to give ground

to suspect that it has been injured in transcribing. This writer often, indeed, uses tautologies ; but, except in this passage, they occasion no darkness or perplexity. The clause, *εκεινο εις ο ευεθισαν οι μαθηται αυτε*—E. T. *that wherein his disciples were entered*—is not in the Al. nor in some other MSS. There is no corresponding clause in the Vul. Go. Sax. Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions ; nor in Nonnus. Ben. and Mill reject it. The Sy. has read the clause, but avoided the tautology, by omitting the following clause in this verse, to the same purpose—*αλλα μονοι οι μαθηται αυτε απηλθον*. I have adopted the reading of the Vul. as preferable upon the whole.

27. *For to him the Father, that is, God, hath given his attestation, τριον γαρ ο πατηρ εσφραγισεν, ο Θεος*. E. T. *For him hath God the Father sealed*. By the manner in which *ο Θεος, God*, is introduced in the end of the sentence, it is manifestly done in explanation of *ο πατηρ* ; accordingly, the sentence is complete before that word is added. It was the more pertinent here to add it, as our Lord, in the preceding part of the sentence, is called *the Son of Man*. It might, therefore, be supposed, that, by the Father, who vouched him, is meant some human being. The addition, *ο Θεος, that is, God*, entirely precludes this mistake. *The Father* was a title from the earliest ages given to the Deity, to distinguish him as the universal parent, or author of all things.

31. *He gave them bread of heaven to eat, αριτον εκ τε ερανε εδωκεν αυτοις φαγειν*. E. T. *He gave them bread from heaven to eat*. The words are capable of being translated either way. But *bread of heaven* appears to me an expression of greater energy than *bread from heaven*. Besides, it is more suitable to the passage in the Psalms referred to, where it is called *corn of heaven*, and *angel's food*.

32. *Moses did not give you the bread of heaven, ου Μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν τον αριτον εκ τε ερανε*. E. T. *Moses gave you not that bread from heaven*. Here, though the difference in expression is but small, the difference in meaning is considerable. The latter seems to point only to the place whence the manna came. The pronoun *that*, which is quite unwarranted, conduces much to this appearance. The former points to the true nature of that extraordinary food. Our Lord's declaration, as I imagine, imports, that it is in a subordinate sense only that what dropped from the

clouds, and was sent for the nourishment of the body, still mortal, could be called the bread of heaven, being but a type of that which hath descended from the heaven of heavens, for nourishing the immortal soul unto eternal life, and which is, therefore, in the most sublime sense, *the bread of heaven*.

33. *That which descendeth from heaven, ὁ καταβαινων εκ του ουρανε.* E. T. *He who cometh down from heaven.* Let it be observed, that ὁ αἰτος, to which this participle refers, is of the masculine gender, and by consequence, susceptible of the interpretation I have given it. Let it be further observed, that this whole discourse is figurative, and that it appears, from what follows, that our Lord meant not at once to lay aside the veil wherein he had wrapped the sentiments. The request made to him in the very next verse, *give us always this bread*, shows, that he was not yet understood as speaking of a person, which he must have been, if his expression had been as explicit as that of the E. T. It is only in verse 35, that he tells them plainly, that he is himself the bread of which he had been speaking. In this exposition, I agree entirely with Dod. Hey. Wy. and Wor. and some of our best commentators.

39. *This is the will of him who sent me, τουτο εστι το θελημα του πεμφαντος με πατρος.* But the word πατρος is wanting in the Al. and several other MSS. It is not found in the Cop. and Ara. versions. The whole verse is wanting in the Go. Several of the fathers also appear not to have read the word παιρος in this place; it is wanting also in many La. MSS. As this verse is explanatory of the preceding, whereof a part is repeated, it suits the ordinary method of composition not to mention πατρος in this place, as it does not occur in the words referred to. Mill, and some other critics, agree in rejecting it.

41. *I am the bread which descended from heaven, εγω ειμι ὁ αἰτος ὁ καταβας εκ του ουρανου.* Vul. *Ego sum panis vivus qui de celo descendi.* The addition of *vivus*, in this place, has no support from MSS. or versions; no, not even the Sax. version.

45. *Every one who hath heard and learnt from the Father, cometh unto me, πας ουν ὁ ακουσας παρα του πατρος και μαθων ερχεται προς με.* E. T. *Every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Markland justly observes,

that, as the preceding words are, *they shall be all taught of God*, it would have been more consequential to subjoin, *every man, therefore, that cometh unto me, hath heard and learnt of the Father*: and there is no doubt that it is only in this way that the affirmation can be deduced, as a consequence, from what preceded. But, in some MSS. of note, the illative particle *οὖν* is not found; nor is there any thing corresponding to it in the Vul. Cop. Go. and Sax. versions. Origen also omits it. Now, the omission of this particle corrects entirely the incoherency. In a case of this kind, where the connection is plainly injured by the particle, the reason above mentioned is ground sufficient for excluding it; for it is plain, that transcribers have used more freedom with connexive particles, than with the other parts of speech. And we may add, that those of this class, in supplying such helps, commonly do not consult the understanding so much as the ear.

51. *Is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world, ἡ σαρξ μου ἐστὶν ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.* Vul. *Caro mea est pro mundi vita.* The clause *ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω* is wanting in three noted MSS. and in the Eth. and Sax. versions, as well as in the Vul.

53. *Ye have not life in you, οὐκ ἐχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.* E. T. *Ye have no life in you.* The version I have given, is closer, both to the letter and to the sense. *The life* spoken of, is called, both before and after, *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*. The adjective, though sometimes dropped, is always understood, whilst the subject of discourse continues to be the same. The import of our Lord's words is, therefore, not that there was no living principle of any sort in those who rejected him (though the expression, in the common translation, seems to imply as much), but that they had nothing of the life, about which he had been discoursing to them.

55. *For my flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink, Ἴ γὰρ σαρξ μου ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ βρωσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμα μου ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ ποσις.* A few MSS. read *ἀλεθῆς* in both places. With them agree the Cop. and second Sy. versions. The literal translation of this reading is, *for my flesh is the true meat, and my blood is the true drink.* The difference in meaning is not material, and if it were, there is not sufficient authority, in this place for an alteration.

56. The Cam. MS. and one of Stephens's, after *αὐτῷ*, add, *καθὸς ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ. Ἀμην ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν· εἰ μὴ λαβήτε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν αὐτῷ. As the Father is in me, and I am in the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless ye receive the body of the son of man as the bread of life, ye have not life in him.* That Dr. Mill should on so slight authority, even by his own account (Proleg. 1268, &c.), favour an addition which, as Whitby observes (Exam. Millii), has the sanction of no ecclesiastical writer, no translation, no commentary, and is, besides, unsuitable to the style of the context, is truly amazing.

57. *As the Father liveth who sent me, and I live by the Father ; even so, he who feedeth on me, shall live by me—καθὼς ἀπέστειλε με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ ζῶ δια τὸν πατέρα· καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, καὶ κείνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμε. E. T. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father ; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.* In the Oriental tongues, the present participle supplies the present of the indicative. We have an example of it in the above passage : but the illustration conveyed in that manner is more clearly expressed in modern tongues, when rendered by the indicative. I have, therefore, taken this method here, which is approved by Gro. and followed by Cas. who says, *quemadmodum vivit pater qui me misit.* Maldonat also explains it in the same manner. The clauses, *καθὼς ἀπέστειλε με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ ζῶ δια τὸν πατέρα*, make not a complete comparison, but only, what I may call, one moiety of a comparison, whereof what follows, *καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, καὶ κείνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμε*, makes the other. A comparison of the same taste we have, ch. x. 14, 15. It must be owned, that *δια*, with the accusative, commonly marks the final, not the efficient, cause, answering to the La. *propter*, not to *per*. But it is confessed on all sides, that this does not always hold. The Vul. indeed, Er. and Zu. render it *propter* ; Cas. and Be. *per*. But even the expounders of the Vul. and translators from it, consider the preposition *propter* here, as equivalent to *per*. P. R. and Sa. render it in Fr. *par* not *pour*. Maldonat and Si. admit that *propter* means here the same as *per*. The whole scope of the context is so manifestly favourable to this interpretation, and adverse to the other, as to leave no reasonable doubt.

69. *The son of the living God, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.* Vul. *Filius Dei.* Τοῦ ζῶντος is wanting in a few MSS. The same defect is found in the Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions, as in the Vul. Nonnus also omits this epithet.

70. *A spy.* Diss. VI. P. I. § 4, 5, 6.

CHAPTER VII.

8. *I go not yet, ἐγὼ οὐπω ἀναβαίνω.* Vul. *Ego autem non ascendo.* The Cam. and another MS. read οὐκ for οὐπω. The Cop. Sax. and Eth. versions read as the Vul.

12. *Much whispering, γογγυσμός πολυς.* E. T. *Much murmuring.* The word *murmuring* would in this place, convey the notion of discontent, grumbling. This does not appear to be suggested by the original term. It expresses solely the secrecy and caution which the people found it convenient to use in speaking on this subject, being prompted, not by their resentments, but by their fears. Γογγυσμός, in this, stands in opposition to παρόρησια in the next verse.

15. *Whence cometh this man's learning? πῶς οὗτος γραμματα οἶδε;* An. *How came he acquainted with the Scriptures?* Some foreign translators also render the words in the same manner. It was no doubt our Lord's acquaintance with the Scriptures, and reasoning from them, which occasioned the remark. But there appears no reason for confining the word *γραμματα* to this signification. Indeed, the expression, *τα ἔγρα γραμματα*, occurs, 2 Tim. iii. 15. in this sense; but this is rather an argument against rendering it so here, where *γραμματα* has neither the epithet nor the article with which it is accompanied in that place. The article for the sake of emphasis, invariably attends *γραφή* (which without it, means no more than *a writing*), when it denotes *the Scriptures*. We cannot, then, think, that so vague a term as *γραμματα*, without any mark of distinction, would be used for the same purpose. Further, *γραμματα*, for denoting *letters*, or *learning* in general, occurs elsewhere, both in the N. T. and in the ancient version of the Old. See Acts xxvi. 24. Is. xxix. 11, 12; where it may be observed, that *ἐπιστάμαι γραμματα* is used in a way entirely similar to the *γραμματα οἶδε* of the passage under examination. Add to this, that, if our Lord had understood by *γραμματα*, *the Scriptures*, he would not surely, verse

16th, have distinguished the doctrine learnt from them, from the doctrine taught by the Father.

17. *Whosoever is minded to do his will, εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν.* E. T. *If any man will do his will.* As the *Auxiliary will* is often no more than a sign of the future, it expresses but weakly the import of the verb *θελη*. To say, with An. and Hey. *is inclined*, or, with Wor. *if any man desire*, is still worse; because these expressions always denote a disposition of mind which comes short of a purpose or resolution, and from which we can hardly promise any thing. Dod. says, *determined*, which is very good. I prefer, with Pearce, the word *minded*. Mt. xvi. 24. N. L. xiii. 31. N.

18. *Is a stranger to deceit, αδικια εν αυτω ουκ εστιν.* In the use of the Seventy, *αδικειν* often denotes, *to lie, to prevaricate, to deceive*, and *αδικια, falsehood, deceit*, which is evidently the most apposite meaning in this place, where it is contrasted to *αληθης*. In this way, Beau. and some other late interpreters, have rendered the word.

21, 22. *I have performed one action which surpriseth you all. Moses instituted circumcision amongst you, εν εργον εποιησα και παντες θαυμαζετε. Δια τουτο Μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν την περιτομην.* E. T. *I have done one work, and ye all marvel. Moses, therefore, gave unto you circumcision.* I have, with The. who is followed by some of our best critics, joined *δια τουτο* to the end of verse 21. Nothing can be more incongruously connected than the words are in the Eng. and most other modern translations; where our Lord's performing a miracle is represented as the cause why Moses gave them circumcision. It is justly observed by Be. (though he has followed a different method in translating) that if *δια τουτο* be construed with *θαυμαζετε*, which makes an alteration only on the pointing, we have an example of the same construction and arrangement with the same verb. Mr. vi. 6. *εθαυμαξε δια την απιστιαν αυτων; he wondered at their unbelief.* Different methods have been adopted by translators, which in my judgment, are forced and unnatural. The method here followed is that taken by Dod. Wes. Wy. and Wor.

22. *Circumcise on the Sabbath.* The precept of circumcision required that every male child should be circumcised the eighth

day from his birth. Gen. xvii. 10, &c. Lev. xii. 3. Though the eighth day happened to be the Sabbath, this ceremony was not deferred; and the law of circumcision vacated the law of the Sabbath.

23. *Because I have on the sabbath, cured a man, whose whole body was disabled? ὅτι ὅλον ἀνθρώπου ὑγίη ἐποίησα, ἐν σαββατῷ; E. T. Because I have made a man every whit whole, on the sabbath day? Dod. That I have cured a man entirely on the sabbath?* This does not differ in meaning from the E. T. which with most other versions denotes only the completeness of the cure. All that they say, might have been said with propriety, if no more than a finger or a toe had been affected. Whereas the words ὅλον ἀνθρώπου ὑγίη ποιεῖν plainly intimate that it was not a single member only, but the whole body that was cured. Beau. seems to be the first modern interpreter who had fully expressed the sense. *De ce qu'un jour de sabbat, j'ai guéri un homme qui étoit incommodé dans tout son corps.* Our Lord doubtless alludes to the cure wrought at Bethesda, on the man who had been eight and thirty years in distress. I have changed the word *diseased*, which was perhaps too strong, for *disabled*, which is more conformable to what we learn from ch. v. 5, &c.

24. *Judge not from personal regards, μὴ κρινετε κατ' ὄψιν. E. T. Judge not according to the appearance.* This phrase is ambiguous. It may mean either the external circumstances of the case, or the dignity of the parties concerned; but more readily conveys to our thoughts the former, than the latter of these significations. Whereas *ὄψις* answers to the La. *facies*, and is equivalent to *προσωπιον*, *face* or *person*. It occurs only in two other places of the N. T. ch. xi. 44. and Rev. i. 16. In the one it is rendered *face*; in the other *countenance*. It is often found in the Sep. in the same acceptation. There can be no question that this precept is of the same import with those which enjoin strict impartiality between the parties, or to have no respect of persons in judgment. The application of the precept is pretty obvious from the occasion of it. If they had been strictly impartial and equitable, they would have seen that they could not vindicate Moses for enjoining such a violation of the Sabbatical rest as was occasioned by circumcising, whilst they condemned Jesus for his miraculous cures, which required less labour, and were

not less evidently calculated for promoting a good end. Nay, they could not excuse themselves for the one practice, if Jesus was blameable for the other.

26. *That this is the Messiah, ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς ὁ Χριστός.* E. T. *That this is the very Christ.* The word *ἀληθῶς* is wanting in many MSS.; amongst which are the Cam. and others of note. It is not in the Com. and some other early editions; nor has it been read by some of the primitive writers. There is no word answering to it in the Vul. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Ara. versions. The Sy. and the Eth. have each a word corresponding to it; but as they have none answering to the word *ἀληθῶς*, in the former part of the verse (for the authenticity of which there is so general a consent of MSS. fathers, and versions), there is some ground to suspect a transposition. On the whole, considering also that the word is unnecessary, and in this place rather unsuitable to the ordinary style of the writer, I thought it better to omit it.

28. *Do ye know both who and whence I am? Κάμε οἰδατε, καὶ οἰδατε ποθεν εἰμι.* E. T. *Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am.* As the words are plainly capable of being read as an interrogation, it is, in every respect, most eligible to translate them so in this place. In the way they are commonly rendered, they contain a direct contradiction to what our Lord says, ch. viii. 14. 19. Nor does it satisfy, that both may be true in different senses, since these different senses do not appear from the context. Nay, in effect, he contradicts them in the same breath; inasmuch as he tells the people, that they know not him who sent him. When they said, *We know whence this man is*, the same thing was evidently meant as when they said, ch. vi. 42. *Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?* Now, our Lord tells them plainly, that they do not know his father, and consequently, cannot tell whence (that is, of what parentage) he is. Dod. Wes. Wγ. render the words here interrogatively.

² *He is true who sent me, ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με.* There is generally observed in the N. T. a distinction between *ἀληθῆς* and *ἀληθινός*, when applied to persons; the former answers to the La. *verax*, the latter to *verus*; the one means *observant of truth*, the other *genuine*. The words, therefore, are thought by Grotius,

not improbably, to suggest that *the genuine father* of Jesus, ἀληθινὸς αὐτοῦ πατήρ, was he who sent him; the other, whom they knew was only νομιζόμενος, supposed to be his father. Others think, that as *the true God*, in contradistinction to the false Gods of the nations, is sometimes, in the sacred books, called ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός, the epithet ἀληθινός is here employed to hint, to the attentive and intelligent hearers, that that Almighty Being, who alone is eminently denominated TRUE, is he who sent him. In either case, it does not appear to have been our Saviour's intention to express himself in such a manner as to be equally intelligible to all. His own disciples he brought, by little and little, to the full knowledge of his doctrine. The spiritual, like the natural, day advances gradually. Now the translator ought, as much as he can, to adopt the views of his author.

32. *The chief priests, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.* Vul. *Principes.* In conformity to this version, two MSS. of little account, read ἀρχοντες. The Sax. version follows the Vul.

33. *Jesus, therefore, said, εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς.* E. T. *Then said Jesus unto them.* So great a number of MS. editions, versions, fathers, and critics, reject αὐτοῖς in this place, as leave no reasonable ground to think, that it has originally belonged to it. When we consider also the scope of the passage, we find it would be improper; for this discourse must certainly have been directed, not to the officers of the Pharisees, but to the people.

35. *Will he go to the dispersed Greeks? μὴ εἰς τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορευεσθαι;* Vul. *Numquid in dispersionem Gentium iturus est?* Be. *Num ad eos qui dispersi sunt inter Græcos profecturus est?* After him E. T. *Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles?* It is a manifest stretch to render the dispersion of the Greeks, *those dispersed among the Greeks*; but if this were allowable, the very next clause, *and teach the Greeks?* excludes it, for it is to them surely he goes whom he intends to teach. That Ἑλληνες is ever used in the N. T. for Hellenist Jews, I have seen no evidence, and am therefore now satisfied that this is the only version which the words will bear.

38. *He who believeth on me, as Scripture saith, shall prove a cistern whence rivers of living water shall flow, ὁ πιστευὼν εἰς ἐμὲ*

καθως ειπεν η γραφη, ποταμοι εκ της κοιλιας αυτου ρευσουσιν υδατος ζωντος. E. T. *He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.* As commentators have been at a loss to find the portion of Scripture here referred to, some have joined καθως ειπεν η γραφη to the clause ο πιστευων εις εμε, which immediately precedes, and thus rendered the words, *He who believeth on me so as the Scripture hath commanded,* making the latter clause serve to qualify the former, that it may be understood that not every sort of believer is meant, but he whose belief is of such a particular kind. For my part, I do not find any insinuation in Scripture, that there are, or can be, different ways of believing. Belief may indeed have very different objects. But as to the act of the mind called *believing*, it is always mentioned in holy writ with the same simplicity that seeing, hearing, understanding, and remembering are mentioned. Nor does there appear the least suspicion in the writer, that any one of these should be misunderstood by the reader more than any other. The above mentioned is one of those criticisms which spring entirely from controversial theology: for, if there had not been previously different definitions of *faith* adopted by different parties of Christians, such a manner of interpreting the words had never been devised. Doubtless, therefore, καθως ειπεν η γραφη, is to be explained in the usual way, as referring to some scriptural promise or prediction, of which what is here told would prove the accomplishment. Houbigant thinks that the passage alluded to is in one of Balaam's prophecies, Num. xxiv. 7. which he translates in this manner: *De precordiis ejus aquæ manabunt.* He says some plausible things in support of his opinion, which it would be foreign to my purpose to examine here. I have had occasion formerly to observe, that by such phrases as καθως ειπεν η γραφη, a particular passage of Scripture is not always referred to, but the scope of different passages is given.

39. *The spirit was not yet [given]; ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον.* E. T. *For the Holy Ghost was not yet given.* Vul. *Nondum enim erat spiritus datus.* Αγιον is wanting in several MSS. Origen, Cyril, Hesychius, and Nonnus, seem not to have read it. There is nothing corresponding to it in the Vul. Sy. Cop. Sax. and Arm. versions. It is rejected also by some of the best modern critics. Though there is no word for *given* in the common Gr. it is in the

Vat. MS. the Vul. both the Sy. and the Sax. It seems necessary, in order to complete the sense. The evidence in its favour would otherwise be insufficient.

43. *The people were divided, σχισμα εν τω οχλω εγενετο.* Diss. X. P. III. § 2.

48. *Of the Pharisees.* Diss. IX. P. IV. § 6.

52. *Search, ερευνησον.* Vul. *Scrutari Scripturas.* The only voucher for this variation is the Cam. MS. which adds *τας γραφας.* No version whatever favours it.

² *That prophets arise not out of Galilee, οτι προφητης εκ της Γαλιλαιας ουκ εγγιγεται.* E. T. *For out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.* A great number of MSS. read *εγγιγεται*, and several versions, the Vul. both the Sy. the Goth. and the Sax. render the words in such a manner as though they had read so. Nonnus also says *εγγιγεται.* But we cannot, from this, conclude, with certainty that they read so; for a freedom no greater than the change of the tense in verbs, must be sometimes taken, especially in translating a writer who uses the tenses with such peculiarity of idiom as this Evangelist. It is enough here, that it appears to have been the general sense of interpreters, that the verb was to be understood in the present. Indeed, most of the modern translators, and among the rest the Eng. have in this followed the ancient. It has not a little puzzled expositors to account for so general an assertion from the leading men of the nation, since it is highly probable that Jonah at least arose out of Galilee. On this article I observe, first, that our translators have rendered the expression more absolute than they were warranted by the Gr. It is there literally, *A prophet ariseth not.* They say, *No prophet ariseth.* There is a real difference here. The former, in common speech, denotes no more than that it is not usual; the latter, that it never happens. I have rendered it, in my opinion, more agreeably to the sense, and more suitably to our idiom by the plural number. I observe, 2dly, That men, when their passions are inflamed, are not wont to be accurate in their expressions, or distinct in recollecting, on the sudden, things which make against them. This expression of the Pharisees, therefore, whom prejudice, pride, and envy concurred in blinding, needs not appear so surprising to us. The expedient, to which Bishop Pearce and

others have recurred, of prefixing the article to *προφητης*, without the authority of a single MS. or of a quotation from any ancient author, is, of all resources, the worst. Here it would hurt, instead of mending, the reply. Admit that Jesus had been but a prophet, and not the Messiah, was there no crime, or was there no danger, in forming a plan to destroy him? By such a correction one would make them speak, as if it were their opinion, that they might safely take the life of an innocent man, even though a prophet of God, if he was not the Messiah. The reason of their mentioning a prophet was, because our Lord, by pretending a divine commission, had classed himself among prophets, and therefore had given reason to infer that, if he was not a prophet, he was an impostor, and, consequently, merited the fate they intended for him. For the law, Deut. xviii. 20. had expressly declared, that the prophet who should presume to speak a word in the name of God, which he had not commanded him to speak, should die. Now, they had, on their hypothesis, specious ground for making the remark, as it served to vindicate their designs against his life. But the whole of their argument is marred by making it *the prophet*; for our Lord was not yet understood to have publicly and explicitly declared himself the Messiah.

53. *Then every man went.*—See the note immediately following.

CHAPTER VIII.

1—11. The first eleven verses of this, with the concluding verse of the former chapter, containing the story of the adulteress, are wanting in a great number of MSS. Origen, Chr. The. the Gr. *catena*, though containing no fewer than three and twenty authors, have not read these twelve verses. Euth. a commentator, so late as the twelfth century, is the first who has explained them. At the same time he assures us, in his commentary, they are not to be found in the most correct copies. They were not in any good copy of either of the Sy. versions, printed or MS. till they were printed in the Eng. Polyglot, from a MS. of Archbishop Usher. They are neither in the Go. nor in the Cop. They have been long read by the Greeks in their churches, are in

most of the MSS. found with them at present ; although in some of them they are marked with asterisks or daggers, to show that they are considered as spurious. If they be an interpolation, they are a very ancient one, having been found in some copies before Origen. Some have represented them as having been transcribed from the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews ; others have ascribed them to Papias, who flourished in the beginning of the second century. Many of the best critics and expositors of opposite sects have entertained strong suspicions of them. Such are Er. Olivetan, Cajetan, Bucer, Cal. Be. Gro. Ham. L. Cl. The words of Be. are remarkable ; I shall, therefore, transcribe them. “ Ad me quidem quod attinet, non dissimulo mihi merito “ suspectum esse quod veteres illi tanto consensu vel rejecerunt, “ vel ignorarunt. Deinde quod narrat Jesum solum fuisse relictum cum muliere in templo, nescio quàm sit probabile : nec satis “ cohæret cum eo quod mox, id est, versu duodecimo, dicitur, eos “ rursum alloquutus ; et quod scribit, Jesum digito scripsisse in “ terra, novum mihi et insolens videtur, nec possum conjicere “ quomodo possit satis commodè explicari. Tanta denique lectionis varietas facit ut de totius istius narrationis fide dubitem.” To the expositors above mentioned, I might almost add the Jesuit Maldonat considered in his critical capacity, though, as a true son of the church, he declares himself on the contrary side. For, after fairly deducing the evidences, which are urged for the rejection of this story, he produces, as a counterbalance, the single authority of the council of Trent, and appears to make a merit of sacrificing to it every thing that might be urged from reason on the opposite side. “ Sed hæc omnia,” meaning the evidences he had given of the spuriousness of the passage, “ minus habent “ ponderis, quam una auctoritas ecclesiæ, quæ per concilium Tridentinum, non solum libros omnes quos nunc habet in usu, sed “ singulas etiam ejus partes, tanquam canonicas approbavit.” But in this implicit deference to authority, Maldonat has not preserved an uniform consistency. See the note on ch. xxi. 22, 23. There are some strong internal presumptions, as well as external, against the authenticity of the passage. They who desire to enter farther into the question, may consult Si.’s Crit. Hist. of the Text of the N. T. ch. xiii. and Wet. on the place. Let them also read, for the sake of impartiality, Bishop Pearce’s note C. on verse 11, and his other notes and remarks on the whole story ;

and if they think with him, that all, or the chief objections made by Wet. against the authenticity of the story are fully answered, they will naturally adopt the Bishop's opinion.

6. *Was writing with his finger on the ground, τῷ δακτυλῷ ἐγραψεν εἰς τὴν γῆν.* E. T. *With his finger wrote upon the ground, as though he heard them not.* This is one of the few instances in which our translators have deserted the common Gr. and even the La. in deference to the authority of MSS. a good number of which, and some of the early editions, after γῆν read μη προσποιουμενος; but this clause is not in any translation, that I have seen, of an earlier date than Dio.'s. Being, besides, quite unnecessary, I thought it better to follow the common editions both Gr. and La.

9. *They hearing that withdrew, οἱ δε, ακουσαντες και ὑπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι, εξηρχοντο.* E. T. *And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out.* The clause και ὑπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι is wanting in many MSS. some of the best editions, and in the Vul. Sy. Sax. and Eth. versions.

10. *And seeing none but the woman, και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος.* This clause is wanting in the Cam. and four other MSS. and also in the Vul. Sy. Sax. Cop. and Arm. versions. The sense, however, seems to require it.

² *Hath nobody passed sentence on thee? ουδεις σε κατακριθεν;* E. T. *Hath no man condemned thee?*

11. *Neither do I pass sentence on thee, ουδε εγω σε κατακρινω.* E. T. *Neither do I condemn thee.* The Eng. word condemn is used with so great latitude of signification for *blaming, disapproving,* as well as *passing sentence against;* that I thought it better, in order to avoid occasion of mistaking, to use a periphrasis which exactly hits the meaning of the Gr. word in these two verses.

14. *My testimony ought to be regarded, because I know whence I came, and whither I go, Αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου οτι οίδα ποθεν ηλθον, και που ὑπαγω.* It has been suggested (Bowyer's Conjectures) that the conjunction οτι is not, in this passage, causal, but explanatory, and introduces the testimony meant, *My record is true, that I know whence I came, and whither I am going.*

But though *οὕτως* is often employed for ushering in the subject, it does not suit the connection to render it so here. Had these words, *I know whence I am &c.* been the testimony to which the Pharisees alluded in the preceding verse, where they said, *Thou testifiest concerning thyself &c.* I should admit the justness of the suggestion. But when we observe, that the testimony, v. 12. *I am the light of the world &c.* which occasioned their retort, is quite different; we must be sensible, that to render the words in the way suggested, is to make our Lord's answer foreign from the purpose. It does the worse here, as this appears to be the first time that Jesus used these words, *I know whence I came &c.* If so, they could not be the testimony to which the Pharisees alluded. How, then, does our Lord's argument run, on the common interpretation? In this manner, 'Though it holds in general, that a man's testimony of himself, unsupported by other evidence, is not to be regarded; it is, nevertheless, where other testimony cannot be had, always received, and has that regard which the circumstances of the case appear to entitle it. My mission is a transaction between God and myself. I know whence I came, and whither I go; or of all that relates to the nature and end of my mission, I am conscious. But no other man is thus conscious; I can, therefore, produce no human testimony but my own; a testimony which will not be disregarded by those who consider how strongly it is supported by the testimony of God.' (See v. 16, 17, 18.)

15. *Ye judge from passion, ὑμεῖς κατα τὴν σαρκὰ κρίνετε.* E. T. *Ye judge after the flesh.* Σαρξ, in the language of the N. T. is frequently used to denote the inferior powers of the soul, the passions and appetites, and is, in this meaning, opposed to πνεῦμα, which denotes the superior faculties of reason and conscience. Thus, *κατα σαρκὰ περιπατεῖν*, is to act habitually under the influence of passion and appetite. Though, from the use of the common version, we are habituated to the phrase *after the flesh*, to the much greater number it conveys no distinct meaning. It only suggests something which, in general, is bad. Diss. I. P. I. § 11. N. § 14. N.

20. *The treasury*, Mr. xii. 41. N.

24. *Ye shall die in your sins; that is, impenitent, hardened.* It may also denote, that they should die suffering the punishment

of their sins. In this explanation it conveys a prediction of the destruction of their city and state, in which it is not improbable that some of our Lord's hearers on this occasion, afterwards perished.

25. *The same that I told you formerly, την αρχην ὅ, τι και λαλω ὑμιν.* The E. T. is to the same purpose. *Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning: την αρχην.* for *κατα την αρχην*, is entirely in the Gr. idiom, for *in the beginning, formerly.* In this way it is used by the Seventy, Gen. xiii. 4. xliii. 18, 20. Dan. viii. 1. In this way it is explained by Nonnus.

Ὅτι περὶ ὑμῶν

Ἐξ αρχῆς αὐριζόν.

In this way also it is rendered in the M. G. *απο την αρχην.* When we have such authority for the meaning of the word (the best of all authorities for scriptural use), I see no occasion for recourse to profane authors. Misled by these, Dod. unites the passage with the following words, v. 26. *πολλα εχω περι ὑμων λαλειν και κρινειν*, into one sentence, thus rendering the whole, *Truly, because I am speaking to you, I have many things to say and judge concerning you*, in which it is not in my power to discover any meaning or coherence. First, we have no answer given to the question put; 2dly, we have things introduced as cause and effect, which seem but ill fitted to stand together in that relation. Could his speaking to them be the cause of his having many things to judge concerning them? Vul. *Principium qui et loquor vobis.* For the *qui* there has no support from either Gr. MSS. or ancient versions. Nay, some ancient Lat. MSS. read *quod.*

27. *That he meant the Father, ὅτι τον πατερα αυτοις ελεγεν.* Vul. *Quia patrem ejus dicebat Deum.* The Cam. MS. adds, *τον Θεον*, which, with the Sax. version, seem to be in this place the only testimonies in favour of the Vul.

28. *Then ye shall know what I am, τότε γνωσεσθε ὅτι εγω ειμι.* E. T. *Then ye shall know that I am he.* With Gro. I understand the third word as thus divided, ὅ τι, which is the same as *τι, quid, what.* In this way there is a direct reference to the question put, verse 25, *Who art thou?* It has this advantage also, that it leaves no ellipsis to be supplied for completing the sense; and the con-

nexion is both closer and clearer than in the common version. L. Cl. has taken this method in rendering the words into Fr. *Alors vous connoîtrez ce que je suis*. P. R. and Sa. though translating from the Vul. which says, *quia ego sum*, go still nearer the terms of the question, and say, *qui je suis*, who I am. In Eng. the An. and Hey. follow L. Cl. as I also have done. In this way, the full import of the words is given with sufficient clearness.

33. *Some made answer, απεκριθησαν αυτω*. E. T. *They answered him*. The whole scope of the place shows, that it was not those believers to whom Jesus had addressed himself in the two preceding verses, who are here represented as answering. But such expressions as *ελεγον, απεκριθησαν*, are sometimes used indefinitely, and import only *it was said, it was answered*. What follows evinces that they were far from being believers who made this answer.

38. *Ye do what ye have learnt from your father; υμεις ον εωρακατε παρα τω πατρι υμων ποιειτε*. E. T. *Ye do that which ye have seen with your father*. But in a considerable number of MSS. some of them of note, for *εωρακατε*, we read *ηκουσατε*. It was so read by Origen and Cyril. It is followed by the Eth. Cop. Go. and second Sy. versions. I agree with Bishop Pearce in thinking this reading preferable in point of propriety. It is for this reason, which is of the nature of internal evidence, that I have adopted the correction, otherwise not strongly supported.

² *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would act as Abraham acted, ει τεκνα του Αβρααμ ητε, τα εργα του Αβρααμ ποιειτε αν*. Vul. *Si filii Abrahæ estis, opera Abrahæ facite*. To warrant this version the original should be *Αβρααμ εστε, τα εργα του Αβρααμ ποιειτε*. Yet there is no MS. which reads entirely in this manner.

43. *It is because ye cannot bear my doctrine, οτι ου δυνασθε ακουειν λογον τον εμον*. E. T. *Even because ye cannot hear my word*. The verb *ακουειν* denotes frequently in Scripture, and even in profane authors, not barely *to hear*, but *to hear patiently*; consequently *not to hear* often means *not to bear*. The Eng. verb, *to hear*, has sometimes, I acknowledge, the same meaning, but more rarely: and in consequence of the uncommonness, the literal version has somewhat of an ambiguous appearance which the original has not. The An. Hey. and Wor. have all avoided the ambiguity, though not quite in the same manner.

44. *He was a manslayer, εκεινος ανθρωποκτονος ην.* E. T. *He was a murderer.* The common term for murderer in the N. T. is *φονευς*. I have here made choice of a less usual name, not from any disposition to trace etymologies, but because I think it is not without intention, that the devil, a being not of earthly extraction, is rather called *ανθρωποκτονος* than *φονευς* as marking, with greater precision, his ancient enmity to the human race. When the name *murderer* is applied to a rational being of a species different from ours, it naturally suggests that the being so denominated is a destroyer of others of his own species. As this is not meant here, the Evangelist's term is peculiarly apposite. At the same time I am sensible, that our word *manslaughter* means, in the language of the law, such killing as is indeed criminal, though not so atrocious as *murder*. But in common use it is not so limited. Hey. says, to the same purpose, *a slayer of men*.

45. *Because I speak the truth, ye do not believe me, ουτι την αληθειαν λεγω, ου πιστευετε μοι.* Vul. *Si veritatem dico non creditis mihi.* This version, one would almost think, must have arisen from a different reading, though there is none entirely conformable to it in the known MSS. and versions. It may, indeed, be thought an objection against the common reading, that there is something like exaggeration in the sentiment. How is it possible that a man's reason for not believing what is told him, should be *that it is true*? That this should be his known or acknowledged reason, is certainly impossible. To think or perceive a thing to be true, and to believe it, are expressions entirely synonymous. In this way explained, it would, no doubt, be a contradiction in terms. The truth of the matter may, nevertheless, be the real, though, with regard to himself, the unknown, cause of his unbelief. A man's mind may, by gross errors, and inveterate prejudices, be so alienated from the simplicity of truth, that the silliest paradoxes, or wildest extravagancies, in opinion, shall have a better chance of gaining his assent, than truths almost self-evident. And this is all that, in strictness, is implied in the reproach.

46. *Which of you convicteth me? τις εξ υμων ελεγγει με;* E. T. *Which of you convinceth me?* The word *convinceth* is not the proper term in this place. It relates only to the opinion of the person himself about whom the question is. Our Lord here, in

order to show that the unbelief of his hearers had no reasonable excuse, challenges them openly, to *convict* him, if they can, in any instance, of a deviation from truth. The import of this is, bring evidence of such a deviation, evince it to the world. A man may be convinced, that is not convicted. Nay, it is even possible that a man may be convicted, who is not convinced. I am astonished that Dod. has missed observing this distinction. He is almost the only modern translator into Eng. who has missed it.

² *Of falsehood, περι ἀμαρτίας.* E. T. *Of sin.* Ἀμαρτία not only signifies *sin*, in the largest acceptation, but *error, falsehood, a departure from truth.* Its being contrasted here to ἀληθεια, fixes it to this sense. It immediately follows. *And if I speak truth, why do ye not believe me?*

51. *Shall never see death, θανατον ου μη θεωρηση εις τον αιωνα.* Hey. *Shall not die for ever.* This is at least a very unusual expression. If *not for ever* do not here mean, *never*, it would not be easy, from the known laws of the language, to assign its precise meaning. But the sense, say they, is, *He shall not perish eternally. He shall not suffer eternal death.* I admit that this is the meaning which our Lord had to the expression which he then used. But this meaning is as clearly conveyed in the E. T. as in the Gr. original. Now, if we could make the expression clearer in Eng. than it is in the Gr. we ought not, in the present case, to do it; because we cannot do it, without hurting the scope of the writer in recording this dialogue, which shows the manner wherein our Lord, whilst he taught his faithful followers, was misunderstood by his enemies. The probability, nay, even the possibility, of some of their mistakes will be destroyed, if his expressions be totally divested of their darkness, or even ambiguity. Our Lord spoke, doubtless, of eternal death, when he said, *θανατον ου μη θεωρηση*, but, it is certain, that he was understood by most of his hearers as speaking of natural death; the words then ought to be susceptible of this interpretation. He perceived their mistake, but did not think proper to make any change on his language. The only equivocal word here is *θανατος, death.* *Εις τον αιωνα*, with a negative particle, when the sense is not confined by the verb, has invariably the same meaning, which is *never.* See Mt. xxi. 19. Mr. iii. 29. J. iv. 14. x. 28. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. viii. 13. I said, when the sense is

not confined by the verb, because when the verb implies duration, the meaning of the phrase is different; for it then denotes *not always, not perpetually*. We have an example in this chapter, verse 35 ὁ δε δούλος ου μενει εν τη οικια εις τον αιωνα. *Now the slave abideth not in the family perpetually*. These two, *never* and *not perpetually*, are the only acceptations in Scripture I have discovered of the phrase. Now it cannot be the latter of these that has been meant by Hey.; and if the former, he has not been happy in the choice of an expression, ch. ix. 32. N.

55. *Speak falsely*. Diss. III. § 24.

56. *Longed to see my day*, ηγαλλιασατο ινα ιδη την ημεραν την εμην. E. T. *Rejoiced to see my day*. The words ινα ιδη, immediately following ηγαλλιασατο, show that it cannot mean here *rejoiced*, but *desired earnestly, wished, longed*. It is so rendered by the Sy. ܦܪܫܬܐ. Nonnus, to the same purpose,

Ἡμαρ εμον παλυευκτον ιδειν ηγαλλετο θυμοι.

The Vul. Er. and Zu. say *exultavit*, but both Cas. and Be. *gestivit*. L. Cl. Beau. and almost all the late Eng. interpreters; nay, and even the most eminent Fr. translators from the Vul. as P. R. Sa. and Si. follow in this the interpretation of Be. and Cas.

² *He saw*. His faith was equivalent to seeing.

57. *And thou hast seen Abraham?* και Αβρααμ εωρακας; E. T. *And hast thou seen Abraham?* The form I have given to the interrogation which is still retained, is more expressive of the derisive manner in which the question seems to have been put. Mt. xxvii. 11. with the N.

58. *Before Abraham was born; I am*. πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι, εγω ειμι. E. T. *Before Abraham was, I am*. I have followed here the version of Er. which is close both to the sense and to the letter: *Antequam Abraham nasceretur, ego sum*. Dio. renders the words in the same way in Italian: *Avanti che Abraam fosse nato, io sono*. Dod. Hey. and Wy. translate in Eng. in the same manner. *Eγω ειμι* may indeed be rendered *I was*. The present, for the imperfect, or even for the preterperfect, is no unusual figure with this writer. However, as an uninterrupted duration from

the time spoken of to the time then present, seems to have been suggested, I thought it better to follow the common method.

59. The E. T. adds, *and so passed by*. In the common Greek we have *και παρηγεν ουτως*. But these words are not in the Cam. MS. nor in some of the early editions. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Sy. Vul. or Sax. versions. Cas. and Lu. have them not. Be. considers both this, and the clause immediately preceding, to wit, *passing through the midst of them*, which is also wanting in the Vul. Arm. and Sax. versions, as mere interpolations. He has nevertheless, retained them in his translation. They are rejected by Gro. and Mill. It may be said that one of these clauses at least (if not both) adds nothing to the sense: they have much the appearance of having been copied from other Gospels.

CHAPTER IX.

2. *Who sinned; this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?*
Diss. VI. P. II. § 19.

7. *Wash thine eyes in the pool of Siloam, νιψαι εις την κολυμβηθραν του Σιλοαμ.* E. T. *Wash in the pool of Siloam.* There are two words which occur in the N. T. in the sense of *washing* or *bathing*; yet they are not synonymous, though we have not terms which correspond so exactly as to mark the distinction between them. The words are *νιπτειν* and *λουειν*. The former, *νιπτειν*, or rather *νιπτεσθαι* (for the middle voice is more used), denotes to wash or bathe a part only of the body; the latter, *λουειν*, is to wash or bathe the whole body. This difference, if I mistake not, is uniformly observed in the N. T. Thus, Mt. vi. 17. *το προσωπον σου νιψαι* xv. 2. *ου νιπτονται τας χειρας αυτων*. And in this Gospel the distinction is expressly marked, ch. xiii. 10. *ο λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι*, where the participle *λελουμενος* is used of him whose whole body is washed; and the verb *νιψασθαι* is joined with *τους ποδας*. That the verb *λουειν* is commonly used in the manner mentioned, see Acts ix. 37. Heb. x. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 22. Rev. i. 5. In all which, whether the words be used literally or metaphorically, the complete cleansing of the body or person is meant. There is only one pas-

sage about which there can be any doubt. It is in Acts, xvi. 33. where the jailer, upon his conversion by Paul and Silas, prisoners committed to his custody, is said in the E. T. to have washed their stripes. The verb is *ελουσεν*. But let it be observed that this is not an accurate version of the Gr. phrase *ελουσεν απο των πληγων*, which, in my opinion, implies bathing the whole body, for the sake both of cleaning their wounds, and administering some relief to their persons. The accusative to the active verb *ελουσεν* is evidently *τα σωματα* understood. The full expression is *ελουσε τα σωματα αυτων απο των πληγων*. The same distinction between the words is well observed in the Sep. The word *wash*, in Eng. when used as a neuter verb, without a regimen, is commonly, if not always, understood to relate to the whole body. The word *νιψαι* shows, on the contrary, that the sacred author meant only a part. That the part meant is *the eyes*, is manifest from the context. Not to supply them, therefore, in Eng. is in effect to alter the sense. Nonnus, agreeably to this exposition, says *νιπιτε τον ρεθος*. And when the man himself relates to the people, verse 11, how he had been cured, Nonnus thus expresses this circumstance :

Νιψαμενος σκιεροιο περιτρογον ομματος υλην.

And afterwards, verse 15, to the Pharisees he says, *υδατι πληλον ενιρα*. Mr. vii. 3, 4. N.

8. *They who had before seen him blind, οι θεωρουντες αυτον το προτερον οτι τυφλος ην.* Vul. *Qui viderunt eum prius quia mendicus erat.* Conformable to this are the Al. Cam. and several other MSS. which, instead of *τυφλος*, read *προσαιτης*. Most of the ancient versions agree in this with the Vul. It makes no material difference in the story.

9. *Others, He is like him, αλλοι δε, οτι ομοιος αυτω εστιν.* Vul. *Alii autem, Nequaquam, sed similis est ei.* In conformity to this, four MSS. instead of *οτι* read *ουχι αλλ'*. The Sy. and some other versions agree also with the Vul.

16. *Σχισμα ην εν αυτοις.* Diss. IX. P. III. § 2.

17. *What sayest thou of him for giving thee sight? Συ τι λεγεις περι αυτου, οτι ηνοιξε σου τους οφθαλμους; E. T. What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes? Vul. Tu quid dicis de illu qui aperuit oculos tuos? It would appear that the La. trans-*

lator has read *ὅς* for *ὅτι*. It suits the sense very well, but has no support from MSS. versions, or ancient authors. The common reading is unexceptionable; but the expression in the E. T. does not convey the meaning so distinctly as could be wished. The sense is well expressed by Ham. in his paraphrase. "What opinion of him hath this work of power and mercy to thee, wrought in thee?"

22. *Should be expelled the synagogue, αποσυναγωγος γενηται.* This corresponds, in their discipline, to what we call *excommunication*.

24. *Give glory to God, Δος δοξαν τῷ Θεῷ.* This does not mean, as is commonly supposed, 'Give God the praise for thy cure.' The import is, 'Glorify God by confessing ingenuously the truth.' This expression shows that they believed, or affected to believe, that he had told them lies, and that they wanted to extort a confession from him. It was the expression used by Joshua, ch. vii. 18, 19. to Achan, when he would induce him to confess his guilt in relation to the accursed thing. It was adopted afterwards by the judges, for adjuring those accused or suspected of crimes to acknowledge the truth as in the sight of God. What follows entirely suits this sense. Their speech is to this effect: 'You cannot impose upon us by this incredible story. We know that the man you speak of, who openly profanes the Sabbath, is a transgressor, and therefore can have no authority or commission from God; It will, therefore, be the wisest thing you can do, to confess the truth honestly, as thereby you will give glory to God.' It would appear from their tampering so much with this man, that they hoped by his means to detect some fraud or collusion, by the use of which our Lord had procured so extraordinary a fame for working miracles. But being disappointed in their expectations from him, they were so incensed that they resolved immediately to excommunicate him.

27. *Did ye not hear? και ουκ ηκουσατε;* E. T. *And ye did not hear.* Vul. *Et audistis.* This translator has read *και ηκουσατε*; a reading which has no support from antiquity, except the Sax. version. I think the clause ought to be read as a question, a manner frequent in this Gospel. If it be rendered in the common way, it must mean, 'Ye did not mind what was told you. If so, the verb *ακουειν* is used twice in the same verse in senses to-

tally different. Such an interpretation as supposes this, unless when a paronomasia is evidently intended, ought to be avoided as much as possible.

32. *Never was it heard before*, *ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἤκουσθη*. *Ἀπ' αἰῶνος*, or *ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος*, is a literal version frequently occurring in the Sep. of the Heb. word מֵעוֹלָם in like manner as *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, or *ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος* is of לְעוֹלָם. The former strictly means *from eternity*, the latter *to eternity*. In this sense they are applied to God, Ps. xc. 2. But in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from very early times; and *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* does not always mean *to eternity*, in the strict sense of the word. That the use is nearly the same in pagan writers, has been very well shown by Wet. The meaning of neither phrase, when accompanied with a negative, admits much variation. The one is *antehac nunquam*, *never before*; the other *nunquam dehinc*, *never after*. In regard to the latter, an exception was taken notice of, on ch. viii. 51. Such an interpretation as *from the age*, which some have proposed, conveys no meaning where no particular age has been spoken of. Nor is there any age of the world, that appears to have been distinguished in Scripture, as *the age*, by way of eminence. But a great deal of the reasoning used in criticism, especially scriptural criticism, is merely hypothetical.

34. *Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?* This reproach proceeded from the same general principle from which the question of the disciples, verse 2. arose.

CHAPTER X.

2. *The shepherd always entereth by the door*, ὁ δὲ εἰσερχομενος δια τῆς θύρας, ποιμὴν ἐστὶ τῶν προβάτων. E. T. *He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep*. This mode of speaking with us conveys the notion, that the shepherd is the only person who enters by the door; yet the owner, the door-keeper, and the sheep themselves, also enter the same way. The original expression is manifestly intended to denote the constant, not the peculiar use which the shepherd makes of the door, as opposed to the constant use of thieves and robbers to force their entrance,

by breaking or climbing over the fence. The comparison is made not to the folds used by the common people in remote parts of the country, but to those belonging to the rich in the neighbourhood of a populous city, where the walls and other fences need to be stronger, and the entrance more carefully kept, on account of the greater danger from thieves.

8. *All who have entered in another manner*, πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον. E. T. *All that ever came before me*. But there is a remarkable difference of reading on this passage. The words πρὸ ἐμοῦ, on which the meaning of the sentence entirely depends, are wanting in some of the most ancient, and in a very great number of other MSS. There is nothing corresponding to them in the Vul. which says simply, *Omnes quotquot venerunt*. The first Sy. in like manner has them not; the second Sy. has an expression answering to them; but it is marked, as spurious, with an asterisk. Neither the Go. nor the Sax. has them. They are wanting in the Com. and some other early editions. Most of the ancient expositors appear not to have read them. Some however, have. Among these is Nonnus, who says, πάντες ὅσοι παρὸς ἦλθον. This is the state of the external evidence, with regard to the words in question. And if it be found such as to leave the mind in suspense about their authenticity, the internal evidence against them does, in my opinion, turn the scale. When our Lord, in explaining his public character, uses a comparison introduced by the words *I am*, it is always his manner to suit what he next says of himself, to that, whatever it be, he has chosen to be represented by. Of this we have several examples in this Gospel. Thus, when he says, ch. vi. 51. *I am the living bread which descended from heaven*, it is immediately added, *Who-so eateth of this bread*—This perfectly suits the comparison adopted; for bread is baked to be eaten. Again, ch. xiv. 6. *I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me* [who am the way]. Again, ch. xv. 1. *I am the true vine, and my father is the vine-dresser*. It is added, *Every barren branch in me* [the vine] *he loppeth off*. To come to the contex, verse 11. *I am the good shepherd*; it follows, *the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep*; and, lastly, verse 9. *I am the door; such as enter by me* [the door] *shall be safe*.—Now to this manner, so uniformly observed, the words under examination cannot be reconciled. *I am the*

door, all that ever came before me, *προ μου*, that is, before I the door came. But do we ever speak of a door's coming to any place? This is so far from illustrating the meaning, that it is inconsistent with any meaning, and therefore leads the mind to devise some other image which may suit the words here used. Such indeed, is that employed, verse 11. where our Lord calls himself *the shepherd*. But by no rule of interpretation can we borrow light from a circumstance which had not yet been mentioned. Of this incoherence Maldonat, though he explains the words differently, was entirely sensible. *Non videntur hæc enim*, says he, *cum præcedenti versu satis apte conjungi. Si enim dixisset se pastorem esse, commode et appositè adderet alios non pastores sed fures et latrones fuisse; cum autem dixerit se esse ostium, non apparet qua ratione, qua consequentia addat alios fuisse latrones.* But, beside this unsuitableness to the context, the meaning expressed by *ὄσοι προ εμου ηλθον*, appears exceptionable. Who were those that came before him? Not Moses and the Prophets, surely. For of these our Lord, far from calling them *thieves and robbers*, always speaks honourably. Yet to these we should otherwise most readily apply the expression, especially when we consider that Jesus styles them to his disciples, *the prophets who were before you*. 'The persons here meant,' say some, 'are those who, before his time, assumed the character of Messiah.' But who were these? It does not appear from any history, sacred or profane, that any person, before his time, ever assumed the character or title of Messiah. Afterwards, indeed, agreeably to our Lord's prediction, it was assumed by many. Theudas and Judas of Galilee cannot be meant. They were rather contemporaries. And though both were seditious leaders, and gave themselves out for extraordinary personages, we have no evidence that either of them pretended to be the Messiah. For all these reasons, I think *προ εμου* ought to be rejected as an interpolation. The external evidence, or what I may call the testimonies in its favour, are at least counterbalanced by those against it; and the internal evidence arising from the sense of the expression, and the scope of the passage, is all on the contrary side. I read, therefore, with the Sy. the Vul. and, I may add, the old Italic, of which the Sax. is esteemed by critics a literal translation, *παντες ὄσοι ηλθον*. I consider *ηλθον* as used here for *εισηλθον*, the simple for the compound, used verse 1. and the word *αλλαχοθεν* under-

stood as supplied from that verse. It is not unusual, when there is occasion for repeating a sentiment which has been advanced a little before, to abridge the expression, on the supposition that what is wanting the hearers will supply from memory. It will perhaps be objected to this explanation, that it makes this sentence a mere repetition of what is said in verse 1st. I own that the affirmation in verse 1st is here repeated, but not merely so, as it is attended with a very important explanation. The import of the two verses, which will show exactly their relation, may be thus expressed: 1. 'They who enter the fold otherwise than by the door, are thieves and robbers. 7. I am the door. 8. Consequently they who enter otherwise than by me, are thieves and robbers.' This makes the eighth verse, as it were the conclusion of a syllogism, of which the first and the seventh are the premises. It is remarkable that this has appeared to be the general import of the passage, even to those interpreters who seem either not to have known how it could be deduced, or have attempted a method absolutely indefensible. Dr. Clarke (see his paraphrase of verse 8.) gives a sense to the words which coincides with that here given; but he does not inform us how he makes it out, or in what manner he read the original. Elsner has endeavoured to draw the same meaning from the reading in the common Gr.; but in my judgment, without success. *Λογισθαι προ θυρας* for *to go past a door*, is, I suspect, utterly unexampled. Besides, who was ever accounted either thief or robber, for *going past the door*, if he did not attempt to break into the enclosure? But it may be said, if the words *προ εμου* ought to be rejected, how shall we account for their introduction into so many copies? To this I can only reply, that the misapprehension of the sense, in some early transcriber, may not improbably have led him to take this method of supplying the ellipsis. It is in this manner that the greatest freedoms which have been taken with the sacred text are to be accounted for. Upon the whole, our Lord, when he compares himself to a shepherd, speaks in the character of the great prophet or teacher of God's people; when he compares himself to the door of the sheep-fold, he signifies that it is by him, that is, by sharing in his grace, and partaking of his spirit, that the under-shepherds and teachers must be admitted into his fold, that is, into his church or kingdom, and participate in all the spiritual blessings belonging to its members. In this view, the words

are directed chiefly against the Scribes and Pharisees, considered as teachers, whose doctrine was far from breathing the same spirit with his, and whose chief object was, not like that of the good shepherd, to feed and to protect the flock, but, like that of the robber, or of the wolf, to devour them. I shall only add, before I conclude this note, that the interpretation here given suits the words that follow, as well as those that precede. Thus, “7. I am “the door. 8. All who enter in another manner are thieves and “robbers. 9. All who enter by me, shall be safe.” How common was this method with our Lord, to enforce his sentiments by affirmations and negations thus connected!

14, 15. *I both know my own, and am known by them (even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father); and I give my life for the sheep.* Ch. vi. 57. N. Diss. XII. P. IV. § 3.

16. *I have other sheep besides, which are not of this fold.* This is spoken of the Gentiles, who were afterwards to be received into his church on the same footing with the Jews.

18. *No one forceth it from me, ουδεις αιρει αυτην απ' εμου.* E. T. *No man taketh it from me.* This can hardly be said with propriety, since he suffered by the hands of others. The Eng. verb *take*, does not express the full import of the Greek *αιρω*. In this place it is evidently our Lord's intention to inform his hearers, that his enemies could not, by violence, take his life, if he did not voluntarily put himself in their power.

22. *The feast of the dedication, τα εγκαινια.* It might be rendered, more literally, *the feast of the renovation.* But the other name has obtained the sanction of use. This festival was instituted by Judas Maccabæus, 1 Mac. iv. 59. in memory of their pulling down the altar of burnt offerings, which had been profaned by the Pagans, and building a new one, dedicated to the true God.

² *It being winter, χειμων ην.* This festival began on the twenty-fifth of the month *Casleu*, and was kept for eight days. It fell about the middle of our *December*.

25. *I said to you, but ye believed not, “the works which I do in “my father's name, testify of me,” ειπον υμιν και ου πιστευετε τα εργα α εγω ποιω εν τω ονοματι του πατρος μου, ταυτα μαρτυρει περι εμου.* E. T. *I told you, and ye believed not; the works*

that I do in my father's name, they bear witness of me. The words are capable of being rendered either way; but there is this difference: rendered in the one way, they are conformable to fact, as appears from this very Gospel—"I said to you, the works which I do," &c. That he had said this, we learn from ch. v. 36. In the other way rendered, the words "I told you," can refer only to what they asked him to tell them, to wit, whether he were the Messiah or not. Now, it does not appear from this, or from any other Gospel, that he had ever told them this in express terms, as they wanted him to do. It may be proper to observe, that the Vul. is here, in respect of the sense, agreeable to the version I have given; but, in respect of the expression, plainly points out a different reading. *Loquor vobis, et non creditis, opera quae ego facio in nomine patris mei, haec testimonium perhibent de me.* In conformity to this the Cam. MS. alone, reads *λαλω* for *ειπον*.

26, 27. *Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep, as I told you, obey my voice. ου πιστευετε ου γαρ εστε εκ των προβατων των εμων, καθως ειπον υμιν. Τα προβατα τα εμα της φωνης μου ακουει.* E. T. *Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice.* This case is similar to the former: *καθως ειπον υμιν* is joined, by our translators, to the preceding words; I join them to those which follow. My reason is the same as in the foregoing instance. The words which precede, had not, as far as we are informed, been expressly used by our Lord; the subsequent words had. On the common Gr. there is no change made but in the pointing. Indeed, the clause *καθως ειπον υμιν*, which has occasioned the question, is wanting in several MSS. as well as in the Vul. Cop. Arm. and Sax. versions. To recur to the authority of later interpreters and critics, would, in so plain a case, be quite unnecessary.

29. *My Father, who gave them me is greater than all, ο πατηρ μου ος δεδωκε μοι μειζων παντων εστι.* Vul. *Pater meus, quod dedit mihi, majus omnibus est.* There is nothing in the Gr. MSS. which can confer the least probability on this version of the La. interpreter. Two or three MSS. have *ος* for *ος*. The Al. reads *μειζον* for *μειζων*. The Cop. and Sax. versions agree with the Vul.

30. *I and the Father are one, εγω και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν.* The word is not *εἷς*, *one person*, but *έν*, *one thing*, or the same thing. It might have been so rendered here; but the expression is too homely, in the opinion of some excellent critics, to suit the dignity of the subject. The greater part of foreign interpreters have thought otherwise. Vul. Er. Zu. Cas. Be. *Ego et pater unum sumus.* Lu. *Ἐγώ and ὁ πατήρ σιν εἷς.* Dio. *Io e il padre siamo una istessa cosa.* L. Cl. *Mon pere et moi sommes une seule chose.* P. R. Si. and Sa. *Une meme chose.* What is distinguished in the original, we ought, if possible, to distinguish. Yet no Eng. translator known to me has, in this, chosen to desert the common translation.

34. *Is it not written in your law?* Here we find the book of Psalms, whence the passage quoted is taken, included under the name *law*, which is sometimes used for the whole Scriptures of the O. T.

35. *To whom the word of God was addressed, προς ἑς ὁ λογος του Θεου εγενετο.* It has been observed justly, that the words may be rendered, *against whom the word of God was pointed.* What gives countenance to this interpretation, is, that God, in the place quoted (Ps. lxxxii. 6.) is severely rebuking and threatening wicked judges and magistrates. On the whole, however, I prefer the version here given.

² *And if the language of Scripture is unexceptionable—και ου δυναται λυθηναι η γραφη.*—E. T. *And the Scripture cannot be broken.* I do not know a meaning which, by any of the received laws of interpretation, we can affix to this expression, *Scripture cannot be broken.* Yet it is impossible for one who attends to our Lord's argument, as it runs in the original, to entertain a doubt about the clause which answers to it in the Gr. Our Lord defends what he had said from the charge of blasphemy, by showing its conformity to the style of Scripture in less urgent cases: insomuch that, if the propriety of Scripture language be admitted, the propriety of his must be admitted also. This is one of those instances wherein, though it is very easy for the translator to discover the meaning, it is very difficult to express it in words which shall appear to correspond to those of his author. In such cases, a little circumlocution has always been allowed.

36. *Whom the Father hath consecrated his Apostle to the world, ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγάσεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.* E. T. *Whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world.* That ἀγιαζειν, in Scripture, often denotes to consecrate, to set apart to any religious or important purpose, has been shown, Diss. VI. P. IV. § 9—13. It is evident, that it is only in this sense applicable here. There are two words which Jesus chiefly uses for expressing his mission. One is, πέμπω, the other ἀποστέλλω; the former a more familiar, the latter a more solemn, term. It is from the latter that the name *Apostle* is derived. Our Lord, in my opinion, has often an allusion to this title, when it does not appear in the E. T. because both words are promiscuously rendered *send*. And though here the word *send* does but feebly express the import of the original; for it may be said of every man, that God hath *sent* him into the world; I do not deny that, in most cases, both words are properly so rendered, and that the purport of the sentence is justly conveyed. In a few, however, where there seems to be an allusion to the title ἀποστολοὶ, by which he had distinguished the twelve, it may be allowable to change the term for the sake of preserving the allusion. Thus, ch. xvii. 18. when our Lord, in an address to God, represents the mission of his Apostles by him, as analogous to that which he had himself received from his heavenly Father, he uses these emphatical words: Καθως ἐμε ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον. I have, for the sake of exhibiting the analogy with like energy, rendered the words in this manner: *as thou hast made me thy Apostle to the world, I have made them my Apostles to the world.* Jesus is accordingly called, Heb. iii. 1. *the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.* He is the Apostle of God; they were the Apostles of Christ. Hence appears more strongly the propriety of what he said, L. x. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.* Thus making them, in respect of their mission as teachers, stand in the same relation to him, in which he, as Heaven's interpreter, stood to God. In like manner, in the verse under examination, as the word ἡγάσεν evidently means *consecrated*, or set apart for a sacred office, ἡγάσεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν is, by a common idiom, used for ἡγάσεν τοῦ ἀποστέλλεσθαι; or, which is the same, ἡγάσεν εἶναι ἀποστολόν.

² For calling himself his son, *ὅτι εἶπον, υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰμι.* E. T. *Because I said, I am the Son of God.* Let it be observed, that our Lord's word here is *υἱὸς*, not *ὁ υἱὸς*. It is not, therefore, so definite as the common version makes it. At the same time, the want of the article in Gr. (as I have elsewhere observed) does not render the words so expressly indefinite, as, in our language, the indefinite article would render them, if the expression were translated *a Son of God*. For the sake, therefore, of avoiding an error on either side, I have chosen this oblique manner of expressing the sentiment. Mt. xxvii. 54. N.

39. *They attempted again—ἐξήτουν παλιν—.* The Vul. has no word answering to *παλιν*, which is also omitted by the Cam. and a few other MSS.

CHAPTER XI.

4. *Will not prove fatal, οὐκ ἐστὶ πρὸς θάνατον.* E. T. *Is not unto death.* That the former way of rendering gives the full import of the Gr. expression, as used here, cannot be questioned. It, at the same time, preserves the ambiguity.

10. *Because there is no light, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ.* E. T. *Because there is no light in him.* Knatchbull has very properly observed, that the pronoun *αὐτῷ*, here, manifestly refers to the noun *κοσμοῦ*, in the end of the preceding verse; and should, therefore, be rendered *in it*. Common sense, as well as the rules of construction, require this interpretation. His stumbling in the night, is occasioned by the want of that which prevents his stumbling in the day. *In it*, however, is better omitted in Eng. where it would encumber, rather than enlighten, the expression, of itself sufficiently clear.

25. *I am the resurrection and the life*; that is, 'I am the author of the resurrection and of the life'—a very common trope in Scripture of the effect for the efficient. In this way, God is called *our salvation*, to denote *our Saviour*; and Jesus Christ is said, 1 Cor. i. 30. to be made of God unto us, *wisdom*, and *righteousness*, and *sanctification*, and *redemption*; that is, the source of these blessings.

27. *Thou art the Messiah, the Son of God, he who cometh into the world, συ ει ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υἱος του Θεου, ὁ εἰς τον κοσμον ερχομενος.* E. T. *Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.* I have had occasion to take notice (in another place, Diss. V. P. IV. § 3—6. 14.) of the three titles just now mentioned, as different denominations or descriptions by which the same great personage was distinguished. I have, therefore, kept them distinct. The two last are, as it were, compounded into one in the E. T. I have also observed, that the proper title is not *he who should come*, but *he who cometh*. It was very natural in Mary, when professing her faith in Jesus, in consequence of the question so publicly put to her, to mention all the principal titles appropriated to him in Scripture.

37. *Who gave sight to the blind man, ὁ ανοιξας τους οφθαλμους του τυφλου.* Vul. *Qui aperuit oculos cæci nati.* E. T. *Which opened the eyes of the blind.* There is no Gr. MS. yet known which authorises the addition of *nati*, nor any version but the Cop. The singular number, with the article, here employed by the Evangelist, shows a manifest allusion to one individual. *Οἱ τυφλοι* is properly *the blind*, which, when no substantive is added, is understood to be plural.

38. *Shut up with a stone, λιθος επεκειτο επ' αυτω.* E. T. *A stone lay upon it.* From the way in which the words are rendered in the Sy. version, and from a regard to a just remark of Si. that the preposition *επι*, in the Hellenistic idiom, does not always imply *upon*, or *over*, I have been induced to render the expression in the manner above mentioned; it being not improbable, that, in this respect, the sepulchre was similar to our Lord's.

39. *For this is the fourth day, τεταρταιος γαρ εστι.* E. T. *For he hath been dead four days.* The expression is abrupt and elliptical; a manner extremely natural to those in grief, and, therefore, where it is possible, worthy to be imitated by a translator.

41. *Then they removed the stone, ηραν ουν τον λιθον ε ην ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος.* The last clause, *ε ην ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος*, is wanting altogether in the Vul. the Sy. the Sax. the Arm. the Eth. the Ara. and the Cop. versions, as well as in some noted MSS. The words, *ὁ τεθνηκως κειμενος*, are wanting in the Go. and the second Sy. versions, and in the Al. MS. which reads *ε η* after *λι-*

θου. Nonnus omits the clause entirely. It is rejected by Origen, Mill, and Bengelius; and plainly adds nothing to the sense.

45. The Vul. after *Mariam*, adds *et Martham*, in which it is singular.

49. *Caiaphas, who was high priest that year.* L. iii. 2. N.

² *Ye are utterly at a loss, ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἰδατε οὐδέν.* E. T. *Ye know nothing at all.* It is manifest, from the whole scope of the passage, that it is not with the ignorance of the subject about which they were deliberating, the doctrine and miracles of our Lord, nor with the ignorance of the law for the punishment of offenders of all denominations, that Caiaphas here upbraids them. Accordingly, we do not find, in what he says, any thing tending to give the smallest information on either of these heads. Yet something of this kind is what occurs as the meaning, on first reading the words in most translations. But what he upbraids them with here, is plainly the want of political wisdom. They were in perplexity; they knew not what to resolve upon, or what measure to adopt, in a case which, as he pretended, was extremely clear. It would appear, that some of the sanhedrim were sensible that Jesus had given them no just or legal handle, by any thing he had either done or taught, for taking away his life; and that, in their deliberations on the subject, something had been advanced, which made the high priest fear they would not enter with spirit and resolution into the business. He, therefore, seems here to concede to those who appeared to have scruples, that, though their putting Jesus to death could not be vindicated by strict law or justice, it might be vindicated from expediency and reason of state, or, rather, from the great law of necessity, the danger being no less than the destruction of their country, and so imminent, that even the murder of an innocent man, admitting Jesus to be innocent, was not to be considered as an evil, but rather as a sacrifice, every way proper for the safety of the nation. May we not reasonably conjecture, that such a manner of arguing must have arisen from objections made by Nicodemus, who, as we learn from ch. vii. 50, &c. was not afraid to object to them the illegality of their proceedings, or by Joseph of Arimathea, who was, probably, one of them, and concerning whom we have this honourable testimony, L. xxiii. 50, 51. that he did not concur in their resolutions.

56. *What think ye? Will he not come to the festival? Τι δοκει υμιν, οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην; E. T. What think ye, that he will not come to the feast? This looks as if they knew, or took for granted, that he would not come, and were inquiring only about the reason of his not coming. This is not the meaning of the Evangelist, whose words, in the judgment of the best critics, make properly two questions, and ought to be pointed thus—Τι δοκει υμιν;—οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην;*

CHAPTER XII.

7. *Let her alone. She hath reserved this—Αφες αυτην—τητηρημεν αυτο. Five MSS. read ινα τηρηση. The Vul. in conformity to this, Sinite illam ut servet illud. With this, agree also, the Sax. Cop. and Eth. versions, and the paraphrase of Nonnus. But when the common reading makes a clear sense, which suits the context, the authorities just now mentioned are by no means a sufficient reason for changing.*

² *To embalm me. Ch. xix. 40. N.*

10. *Determined, εβουλευσαντο. E. T. Consulted. I agree entirely with Gro. who observes, on this place, “βουλευεσθαι non est hic consultare, sed constituere, ut Act. v. 33. xv. 37. 2 Cor. i. 17.” It is translated by Beau. avoient resolu, which is literally rendered by the Eng. An. had resolved. Indeed, such a design on the life of a man whom they do not seem to have charged with any guilt, might appear improbable; but the maxim of Caia-phas above explained, ch. xi. 49. ² N. would serve, with judges disposed as those priests then were, to justify this murder also.*

11. *Many Jews forsook them, and believed on Jesus, πολλοι υπηγον των Ιουδαιων και επιστευον εις τον Ιησουν. E. T. Many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus. This interpretation is rather feeble. The Eng. word went, and even the words went away, before the mention of something done, are often little more than expletives. Here the word υπηγον bears a very important sense, and denotes their ceasing to pay that regard to the teaching of the scribes which they had formerly done. This is*

universally acknowledged to be the meaning of the verb in this passage. Bishop Pearce, however, has gone too far, in the opposite extreme, from our translators, where he says, "*withdrew themselves*, i. e. from the public service in the synagogues." The ideas formed from the practice of modern sectaries have led him, in this instance, into a mistake. No sect of the Jews withdrew from the synagogue. Jesus, far from withdrawing, or encouraging his disciples to withdraw, attended the service in the temple at Jerusalem, and in the synagogue, wherever he happened to be. He promoted the same disposition in his disciples, by precept as well as by example, and particularly warned them against disregarding the ministry, on account of the vices of the minister. Mt. xxiii. 1, &c. The same conduct was observed by his Apostles and disciples after him. He foretold them, that they would be expelled the synagogue, ch. xvi. 2. but never gave them permission to leave it, whilst they were allowed by the Jewish rulers to attend it. The book of Acts shows, that they did in fact attend the synagogue every Sabbath, where there was a synagogue to which they had access. Diss. IX. P. IV. § 6.

13. *Israel's King*. Though we find in the common copies, ὁ βασιλευς του Ισραηλ, the article ὁ is wanting in so great a number of MSS. and editions, as to give just ground for rejecting it. For which reason, though the difference is of little moment, I have made use of this expression. Ch. x. 36. ² N.

16. *After Jesus was glorified*; that is, after his resurrection and ascension.

17. *That he called Lazarus*—ὅτι τον Λαζαρον εφωνησεν—Vul. *Quando Lazarum vocavit*. So many MSS. read ὅτε for ὅτι, and so many versions are conformable to this reading, that it is hardly possible to decide between them. The sense is good and apposite either way. But, in such cases, it is better to let things remain as they are.

19. *Ye have no influence*, ουκ ωφελειτε ουδεν. Vul. *Nihil proficimus*, from the reading ωφελουμεν; which has hardly any support from MSS. or versions.

26. *If any man serve me, my Father will reward him*, εαν τις εμοι διακονη, τιμησει αυτον ὁ πατηρ. E. T. *If any man serve me, him my father will honour*. The word τιμη, in Scripture, sig-

nifies not only *honour*, but *reward*, price, wages. The verb τιμαω admits the same latitude of signification. Beau. though he renders the word, in his version, in the common way, *le honorera*, says, in his note upon it, “*autrement le recompensera.*” ΝᾶϚ, he adds in effect, that it ought to be thus rendered here, as it is opposed to *serviug*. “*Comme honorer est ici opposé à servir, il signifie proprement recompenser, ainsi qu'en plusieurs autres endroits de l'écriture.*”

27. *What shall I say? [Shall I say] Father, save me from this hour? But I came on purpose for this hour—Τι ειπω; πατερ, σωσον με εκ της ὥρας ταυτης, αλλα δια τουτο ηλθον εις την ὥραν ταυτην.* E. T. *What shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.* I understand the question here, as ending, not at ειπω, but at ταυτης, at which there should be a point of interrogation; or, rather that the words should be considered as two questions, in the manner done in this version. A similar example we have in the preceding chapter, verse 56th; for, in both, a part of the first question is understood as repeated. There τι δοκει υμιν; δοκει ου με ελθη—; Here, τι ειπω; ειπω, πατηρ σωσον με—; I do not approve, with Markland (Bowyer's Conjectures), that τι should be rendered *whether*, and the question made, “*Whether shall I say, Father, save me?—*” “*or, Father, glorify thy name?*” If these could be supposed to occur to the mind at once, there could not be a moment's hesitation about the preference. It suits much better the distress of his soul, to suggest, at first, a petition for deliverance. But in this he is instantly checked by the reflection on the end of his coming. This determines him to cry out, “*Father, glorify thy name.*” This is not put as a question. It is what his mind finally and fully acquiesces in.

28. *Thy name, σου το ονομα.* For το ονομα, four MSS. not of the highest account, read τον υιον. Such also is the reading of the Cop. Eth. and Ara. versions. The second Sy. has it in the margin.

32. *All men—παντας—.* Vul. *Omnia—.* Agreeably to this, the Go. and the Sax. versions translate. The Cam. and one other MS. read παντα.

34. *From the law; that is, from the Scriptures.* Ch. x. 34. N.

36. *He withdrew himself privately from them, απελθων εκρυ-*

βη ἀπ' αὐτῶν. E. T. *Departed and did hide himself from them.* This, in my apprehension, conveys a sense different from that of the original, which denotes simply, that in retiring, he took care not to be observed by them. The Sy. version is very close, and appears to me to imply no more. The Vul. which says, *abiiit et abscondit se ab eis*, seems to have misled most of the modern interpreters. Cas. has hit the meaning better. *Discessit et eis sese subduxit.*

40. *Blunted their understanding, πεπωροειζεν την αυτων καρδιαν.*
Diss. IV. § 22, 23, 24.

42. *Several, πολλοι.* E. T. *Many.* The Gr. word is of greater latitude than the Eng. and answers more exactly to the Fr. *plusieurs*, which, by translators from that language, is sometimes rendered *many*, sometimes *several*, as suits best the subject. Here, as it is only the minority of those in the highest offices that are spoken of, a minority greatly outnumbered by the opposite party, they can hardly be supposed very numerous.

44. *He who believeth on me, it is not on me he believeth; that is, not only on me.* The expression is similar to that in Mr. ix. 37. *Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me.* Both are explained in the same manner.

47. *But do not observe them, και μη πιστευση.* A considerable number of MSS. amongst which are the Al. and the Cam. read *φυλαξη*; to which agree not only the Vul. which says, *et non custodierit*, but both the Sy. Cop. Arm. Eth. Ara. and Sax. versions, together with the paraphrase of Nonnus:

Και μη ασυλητόιο νοου σφορηγίδα φυλαξη.

49. *What I should enjoin, and what I should teach, τι ειπω και τι λαλησω.* E. T. *What I should say, and what I should speak.* These phrases convey to us no conceivable difference of meaning. If no difference of signification had been intended by the words of the original, the *τι* would not have been repeated before the second verb. The repetition evidently implies, that the subject of the one is not the subject of the other. *Ειπειν* frequently means *to command*, to enjoin, and *λαλειν* to *teach*, to instruct by discourse. When these are thus conjoined, as things related, but not synonymous, they serve to ascertain the meaning of each other; the former regarding the precepts of his religion, the latter its principles.

CHAPTER XIII.

2. *While they were at supper, δειπνου γενομενου.* E. T. *Supper being ended.* Vul. Er. Zu. *Cæna factâ.* Be. *Peractâ.* Cas. *Paratâ.* The two first ways of rendering the words in La. express too much; the last, too little. That supper was *ended*, is inconsistent with what follows in the chapter; and if it was only *prepared*, it would not have been said, verse 4th, *he arose from supper.* Maldonat's solution hardly requires refutation. He affirms, that our Lord that night ate three suppers with his disciples; the paschal supper, their ordinary supper, and the eucharistical supper; if this last might be called a supper. Hence, we find them still eating together, after we had been told, that *supper was ended.* In defence of the way wherein the words are rendered in the Vul. he argues thus: The Evangelist says, not *δειπνου γινομενου*, *cum cæna fieret*, using the present participle, but *γενομενου*, *cum cæna jam facta esset*, using the participle of the aorist. To this, it sufficeth to reply, that the sacred writers use the participle *γενομενου* indiscriminately, for both purposes, but much oftener to express the present, or rather the imperfect, than the past. Thus, when *γενομενης* is joined with *πρωιας*, *οψιας*, *ἡμερας*, or any term denoting a precise portion of time, it invariably signifies that the period denoted by the noun was begun, not ended. Mr. says, vi. 2. *γενομενου σαββατου ηρξατο εν τη συναγωγη διδασκειν.* I should be glad to know of a single interpreter who renders these words—*When Sabbath was ended, he taught in the synagogue.* The words *sabbato facto*, in the Vul. denote no more here, in the judgment of all expositors, than *when Sabbath was come.* Our Lord says, Mt. xiii. 21. *γενομενης θλιψεως δια τον λογον, ευθως σκανδαλιζεται.* Is it whilst the persecution rages, or when it is over, that men are tempted by it to apostatize? I shall add but one other example, from Mt. xxvi. 6, &c. *ιησου γενομενου εν Βηθανια εν οικια Σιμωνος προσηλθεν αυτω γυνη. κ. τ. ε.* Was it after Jesus had been in Simon's house in Bethany, that the woman anointed him with the precious balsam, or when he was there? The Vul. says expressly, *cum Jesus esset in domo Simonis.* I should not have brought so many examples in so clear a case, were it not to

demonstrate, what even critics can forget, how unsafe it is to depend on general rules, without recurring to use, wherever the recourse is practicable.

4. *Mantle, ἱματια.* E. T. *Garments.* Ἰματιον properly signifies *the upper garment, the mantle;* and ἱματια, *garments, or clothes* in general. Diss. VIII. P. III. § 1, 2, 3. Yet the plural is sometimes used for the singular, and means no more than *mantle*, as Mt. xxiv. 18. xxvi. 65. xxvii. 35. ch. xix. 23.

10. *He who hath been bathing, needeth only to wash his feet, ὁ λελουμένος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι.* For the distinction between *λουειν* and *νιπτεσθαι*, see ch. ix. 7. N. This illustration is borrowed from the custom of the times; according to which, those who had been invited to a feast, bathed themselves before they went; but, as they walked commonly in sandals, (unless when on a journey), and wore no stockings, it was usual to get their feet washed by the servants of the family, before they laid themselves on the couches. Their feet, which would be soiled by walking, required cleaning, though the rest of their body did not. The great utility, and frequent need, of washing the feet in those countries, has occasioned its being so often mentioned in the N. T. as an evidence of humility, hospitality, and brotherly love.

13. *Ye call me The teacher and The master, Ὑμεις φωνειτε με Ὁ διδασκαλος και Ὁ κυριος.* E. T. *Ye call me master and lord.* The article in Gr. prefixed to each appellation, and the nominative case employed where, in common language, it would have been the accusative, give great energy to the expression, and show, that the words are applied to Jesus in a sense entirely peculiar. This is not at all expressed by the words, *ye call me master and lord*, as though it had been *φωνειτε με διδασκαλον και κυριον*; for so common civility might have led them to call fifty others. But the titles here given, can belong only to one. This remark extends equally to the following verse. For the import of the titles, see Diss. VII.

23. *Was lying close to his breast.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 3—6.

33. *My children, τεκνια.* E. T. *Little children.* Diminutives answer a double purpose. They express either the *littleness* or

fewness, in respect of size and number, of that to which they are applied, or the *affection* of the speaker. Diss. XII. P. I. § 19. There can be no doubt, that it is for the last of these purposes that the diminutive is used here. In Gr. when the first is only, or chiefly, intended, the word answering to little children is *παιδια*, or *παιδαρια*, not *τεκνια*. With us, the possessive pronoun answers better the purpose of expressing tenderness, for we have few diminutives.

34. *A new commandment.* In popular language, to which the manner of the sacred writers is very much adapted, that may be called a new law which revives an old law that had been in a manner abrogated by universal disuse. Our Lord, by this, warns his disciples against taking for their model, any example of affection wherewith the age could furnish them; or, indeed, any example less than the love which he all along, but especially in his death, manifested for them.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. *Believe on God, and believe on me, πιστευετε εις τον Θεον, και εις εμε πιστευετε.* E. T. *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* The Gr. expression is ambiguous, and is capable of being rendered different ways. The Vul. which has had great influence on the translators in the West, has preferred the latter method, *creditis in Deum et in me credite*; and, in respect of the sense, is followed by Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. The Sy. has, on the contrary, preferred the former, which seems to be more generally adopted in the East. It was so understood also by Nonnus, who thus expresses the sense: *Αλλα Θεο. και εμοι πιστευσαιτε.* This is the sense which the Gr. commentators also put upon the word; and, in this way, Luther interprets them. They are so rendered into Eng. by Dod. Wes. and Wor. The reasons of the preference I have given to this manner, are the following: 1st, In a point which depends entirely on the Gr. idiom, great deference is due to the judgment of those whose native language was Gr. The consent of Gr. commentators, in a question of this kind, is, therefore, of great weight. 2dly, The two clauses are so similarly expressed and linked together by the copulative, that it is, I suspect, unprecedented to make the verb, in one an indicative, and the same verb, repeated in the other, an imperative. The simple and natural way is, to render similarly what is similarly ex-

pressed; nor ought this rule ever to be departed from, unless something absurd or incongruous should follow from the observance of it. This is so far from being the case here, that I remark, 3dly, That, by rendering both in the imperative, the sense is not only good, but apposite. How frequently, in the book of Psalms, are the people of God, in the time of affliction, exhorted to trust in the Lord? Such exhortations, therefore, are not understood to imply a total want of faith in those to whom they are given.

2. *I go to prepare a place for you, πορευομαι ετοιμασαι τοπον υμιν.* Vul. *Quia vado parare vobis locum.* The Al. Cam. and several other MSS. do, in like manner, introduce the clause with *οτι*. The Arm. version also agrees with the Vul. So does the Sax. Nonnus likewise uses this conjunction—*οτι προκελευθος οδευσω*. But the evidence in favour of the common reading greatly preponderates.

11. *Believe, πιστευετε μοι.* Vul. *Non creditis.* This interpretation has doubtless arisen from a different reading. For the negative particle, there is no testimony in confirmation of the Vul. except the Sax. version. The Sy. has not read *μοι*, nor is it necessary to the sense. I have expressed the import of this pronoun, in interpreting the next clause—*ει δε μη, if not on my testimony.*

12, 13. *Nay, even greater than these he shall do, because I go to my Father, and will do whatsoever ye shall ask in my name—και μειζονα τούτων ποιησει οτι εγω προς τον πατερα μου πορευομαι, και ο, τι αν αιτησητε εν τω ονοματι μου, τουτο ποιησω.* E. T. *And greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do.* This rendering is deficient both in perspicuity and in connection. Yet, except in the pointing, I have made no change on the words of the Evangelist. Our Lord's going to his Father, considered by itself, does not account for their doing greater works than he had done; but when that is considered, along with what immediately follows, that he will then do for them whatever they shall ask, it accounts for it entirely. When the 12th verse is made, as in the Eng. translation, a separate sentence, there is little connection, as well as light, in the whole passage. The propriety of reading the words in the manner I have done, has been justly observed by Gro. and others.

13, 14. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son, whatsoever*

ye shall ask in my name, I will do—*ἵνα δοξασθῆ ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. εἰν τι αἰτησῆτε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐγὼ ποιήσω.* E. T. *That the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.* The latter part of the 13th verse, I have detached from the preceding sentence, and joined into one sentence with the 14th verse. This preserves better the simplicity of construction in the sacred writings, and accounts for the repetition in verse 14th, of what had been said immediately before, almost in the same words.

14. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, I will do, εἰν τι αἰτησῆτε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐγὼ ποιήσω.* Vul. *Si quid petieritis me in nomine meo, hoc faciam.* The blunder in transcribing seems here pretty evident; yet it has the support of a few MSS. not of principal account, and of the Go. and Sax. versions.

16. *Monitor, παρακλητον.* E. T. *Comforter.* In the interpretation of this word, critics have been much divided. It is used by no other sacred writer; neither does it occur in the Sep. John uses it in four places of his Gospel, all in reference to the same person, and once in his first Epistle, as shall be observed immediately. The Sy. Vul. and some other ancient versions, retain the original term. Most modern interpreters have thought it better to translate it. Er. sometimes retains the word, and sometimes renders it *consolator*; so does also Leo de Juda. Cas. says *confirmator*, Be. *advocatus*. Under the first or last of these, all the translations into European tongues with which I am acquainted, may be ranged. Lu. Dio. G. F. Beau. P. R. Sa. and all the late Eng. versions but one follow Er. The An. follows Be. Si. though he does not render the word *avocat*, but *defenseur*, may be added; as he shows, in the notes, that he means by *defenseur*, what other interpreters meant by *avocat*; and for the same reason L. Cl. who also renders the word *defenseur*. Ham. has well observed on the passage, that the word is susceptible of these three significations, *advocate*, *exhorter*, and *comforter*. If, instead of *exhorter*, he had said *monitor*, I should readily admit that these three terms comprehend all that is ever implied in the original word. But the word *exhorter* is of very limited import, barely denoting one who by argument incites another to perform something to which he is reluctant; for *exhortation* always pre-supposes some degree of *reluctance* in the person *exhorted*, without

which it would be unnecessary. The term *monitor* includes what is most essential in the import of *exhorter*, as well as that of *remembrancer* and *instructor*, and comes nearer in extent than any one word, in our language, to the original term. I own that the word in classical authors more commonly answers to the La. *advocatus*. But the Eng. word *advocate* is more confined, and means one who, in the absence of his client, is instructed to plead his cause before his judge, and to defend him against his accuser. In this sense our Lord is called *παρακλητος*, 1 J. ii. 1. which is in the E. T. properly rendered *advocate*. *If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*. We have one who, in our absence, appears for us, and defends our cause, before our judge. The notion of an *advocate* brings, along with it, the notion of a *judge* who is to pass sentence, and of a *client* who is to be defended. But, if any regard is due to the scope of the place, the word *advocate* is very improperly introduced, in the passage under examination, where there is nothing that suggests the idea of judge, cause, or party. *The advocate* exercises his office in presence of *the judge*. Whether *the client* be there or not, is of no consequence, as he is represented by his *advocate*. Now this *παρακλητος*, who, we are told, verse 26th, is *The Holy Spirit*, was to be sent to the disciples of Jesus, to remain with them for ever. If the word here then denote *advocate*, and if the Holy Spirit be that *advocate*, are the disciples, to whom he is sent, *the judges*? If not, who is *the judge*? what is the cause to be pleaded? and who are the parties? This interpretation introduces nothing but confusion and darkness. The only plea in its favour, which has any thing specious in it, is that, by the wisdom and eloquence with which the Spirit endowed the Apostles, and first Christian preachers, he powerfully defended the cause of Christ before the world: but as those first teachers themselves were made the instruments or immediate agents of the victory obtained to the Christian cause, over the infidelity of both Jews and Pagans, the Holy Spirit was to them much more properly a *monitor* or *prompter*, than an *advocate*. He did not appear openly to the world, which, as our Lord says, verse 17. *neither seeth him nor knoweth him*; but, by his secret instructions, they were qualified to plead with success the cause of Christianity. Let it be observed further, that our Lord says, that when he himself is gone, his Father will

send them *another παρακλητος*, who will remain with them for ever. From this we learn, 1st. That our Lord himself, when he was with them, had discharged that office among them; and, 2dly, That it was to supply his place in the discharge of the same function, that the Holy Spirit was to be sent. Now when our Lord is said, since his ascension into heaven, to be our *advocate* and *intercessor* with the Father, we perceive the beauty and energy, as well as the propriety of the representation. But we should never think of the title *advocate* for expressing the functions he discharged to his disciples when he sojourned among them upon the earth. We should readily say that to them he acted the part of a tutor, a father, a monitor, a guide, a comforter; but nobody would say that he acted to them as an advocate. I have been the more particular here for the sake of showing that it is not without reason, that Be. has in this been so generally deserted, even by those Protestant interpreters who, on other occasions, have paid but too implicit a deference to his judgment. Is *comforter* then the proper term? *Comforter*, I admit, is preferable. But this appellation is far from reaching the import of the original. Our Saviour, when there was occasion, as at this time in particular, acted the part of a *comforter* to his disciples. But this part is, in its nature, merely occasional, for a time of affliction; whereas that of *monitor*, *instructor* or *guide*, is, to imperfect creatures like us, always needful and important. Were we, in one word, to express the part acted by our Lord to his followers, we should certainly adopt any of the three last expressions rather than the first. Or if we consider what is here ascribed to the Spirit, as the part he is to act among the disciples, it will lead us to the same interpretation. *The Holy Spirit*, says our Lord, verse 26. *whom the Father will send in my name; he will teach you all things, and remind you of all that I have told you.* Is not this to say, in other words, "He will be to you a faithful monitor?" Further, the conjugates of the word *παρακλητος* entirely suit this interpretation. The general import of *παρακαλειν*, in the active voice, is to *admonish*, to exhort, to entreat, and *παρακλησις*, *admonition*, exhortation. It is manifest, as has been justly remarked by Dr. Ham. that in some places the import of the noun has been unduly limited, by being rendered *comfort* or *consolation*; particularly that *παρακλησις, του αγιου πνευματος*, Acts ix. 31. is much more properly rendered *the admonition*, than *the comfort of the Holy Spirit.* Diss. VIII. P. III. § 8.

² It is perhaps hardly worth remarking, that the Mahometans pretend that the coming of their prophet is here predicted. The evangelist, say they, did not write *παράκλητος* *paracletos*, but *περικλυτος* *periclytos*, that is *illustrious*, which is the import of the name *Mahomet* in Arabic. But whence had they this information? The Gospel of John was well known throughout the church, for several centuries before the appearance of Mahomet; whereas the reading alleged by them, had never before been heard of; nor has it been discovered ever since in any one MS. ancient translation, commentary, or ecclesiastical writing of any kind.

18. *I will not leave you orphans, ουκ αφήσω υμας ορφανους.* E. T. *I will not leave you comfortless.* I cannot imagine what could have led our translators into the singularity of deserting the common road, where it is so patent; unless, by introducing *comfortless*, they have thought that they gave some support to their rendering the word *παράκλητος* in the context, *comforter*.

19. *Because I shall live;* that is, return to life. A great part of this discourse must have been dark at the time it was spoken; but the event explained it afterwards.

22. *Wherefore wilt thou discover thyself to us? τι γεγονεν οτι ημιν μελλεις εμφανιζειν σεαυτον.* E. T. *How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us?* The expression *How is it that* is ambiguous, and may be an inquiry about the manner of his discovering himself to them. The words of the Evangelist can be interpreted only as an inquiry into the reason of his discovering himself to them and not to the world. This question arose from the remains of national prejudices in regard to the Messiah, to which the Apostles themselves were not, till after the descent of the Spirit, related in the 2d chapter of the Acts, entirely superior. Our Lord's answer, in the two following verses, though, in all probability, not perfectly understood by them at the time, assigns a reason for the distinction he would make between his disciples and the world, but says nothing about the manner of discovering himself.

24. *Is not mine, but the Father's;* that is (setting aside the idiom), is not so much mine as the Father's. Mt. ix. 13. Mr. ix. 37.

28. *You would rejoice that I go to the Father, εχαρητε αν οτι ειπον, πορευομαι προς τον πατερα.* E. T. *You would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father.* The word *ειπον* is not in the Al. MS. nor in the Cam. It is wanting also in several others. There is nothing which answers to it in either of the Sy. versions, or in the Vul. Goth. Sax. Cop. Arm. Eth. or Ara. Origen, Cyril, Chr. seem not to have read it. The same may be affirmed of Nonnus the paraphrast. Such a concurrence of all the most ancient and most eminent translations, supported by some of the best MSS. and Grecian critics, have induced me to join with Mill and Bengelius in rejecting it.

30. *The prince of the world, ο του κοσμου τουτου αρχων.* E. T. *The prince of this world.* There is such a powerful concurrence of MSS. both those of principal note and others, with both the Sy. versions, some of the most celebrated Gr. commentators, together with Nonnus, in rejecting the pronoun *τουτου*, that not only Mill, but Wet. who is much more scrupulous, is for excluding it.

² *He will find nothing in me, εν εμοι ουκ εχει ουδεν.* E. T. *Hath nothing in me.* Though not so great as in either of the instances immediately preceding, there is considerable authority from MSS. versions, and ancient authors, for reading either *ευρησκει* or *ευρησει*, instead of *ουκ εχει*. For this reason, and because it makes the expression clearer, I think, with Mill, it ought to be admitted.

CHAPTER XV.

2. *He cleaneth by pruning, καθαιρει.* E. T. *He purgeth.* Critics have observed a verbal allusion or paronomasia in this verse. To the barren branch the word *αιρει* is applied; to the fruitful, *καθαρει*. It is not always possible in a version, to preserve figures which depend entirely on the sound, or on the etymology of the words, though sometimes they are not without emphasis. This verse and the following, afford another, and more remarkable, instance of the same trope. As our Lord himself is here represented by the vine; his disciples are represented by the branches. The mention of the method which the dresser takes with the fruitful branches, in order to render them

more fruitful, and which he expresses by the word *καθαίρει*, leads him to take notice of the state wherein the Apostles, the principal branches, were at that time, *Ἰδὴ ὑμεῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε*. It is hardly possible not to consider the *καθαίρει* applied to the branches as giving occasion to this remark, which immediately follows it. Now when the train of the thoughts arises in any degree from verbal allusions, it is of some consequence to preserve them, where it can be easily effected, in a translation. It is for this reason that I have translated the word *καθαίρει* by a circumlocution, and said *cleaneth by pruning*. It is evident that *καθαίρει*, in this application, means *pruneth*. But to say in Eng. simply *pruneth*, would be to throw away the allusion, and make the thoughts appear more abrupt in the version than they do in the original; and to say *cleaneth*, without adding any explanation, would be obscure, or rather improper. The word used in the E. T. does not preserve the allusion, and is, besides, in this application, antiquated. Nonnus appears to have been careful to preserve the trope; for though almost all the other words in the two verses are changed, for the sake of the measure, he has retained *καθαίρειν* and *καθαροὶ*. Few translators appear to have attended to this allusion: yet whatever strengthens the association in the sentences, serves to make them both better understood, and longer remembered.

6. *Like the withered branches which are gathered for fuel, and burnt, ὡς τὸ κλημα, καὶ ἐξηρανθῆ, καὶ συναγοῦσιν αὐτα, καὶ εἰς πῦρ βαλλοῦσι, καὶ καιεταί*. E. T. *As a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned*. Through an excessive desire of tracing the letter, a plain sentiment is here rendered indistinctly and obscurely. Knatchbull's observation is just. In the idiom of the sacred writers, the copulative often supplies the place of the relative, *a branch, and is withered*, for *a branch which is withered*, or *a withered branch*. See Ruth i. 11. Many other examples might be brought from Scripture. The singular number is sometimes used collectively, as *branch* for *branches*. This may account for *αὐτα* in the plural. Some MSS. indeed, and even some versions read *αὐτο*: but the difference does not affect the sense.

8. *So shall ye be my disciples, καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί*. The Cam. and several other MSS. have *γενήσθε* for *γενήσεσθε*, Agree-

ably to which the Vul. says *et efficiamini mei discipuli*. With this also agree the Cop. and Sax. versions.

10. *Ye shall continue in my love, μενειτε εν τη αγαπη μου.* Dod. and Wor. *Ye will continue in my love.* The precept *continue in my love*, in the preceding verse, which must determine the meaning of this declaration, is capable of being understood in two ways, as denoting either *continue to love me*, or *continue to be loved by me*; in other words, 'keep your place in my affection.' In my opinion the latter is the sense, and therefore I have retained the old manner *ye shall* in preference to *ye will*, as the former is frequently the sign of a promise, which I take the sentence to contain to this effect: *If ye keep my commandments, ye shall continue the objects of my love.* For this preference, it is proper to assign my reasons: First, it is most natural to suppose, that when our Lord enjoined them to continue in a particular state, it would be in that state wherein he had signified that they then were. Now this state is manifestly that of being loved by him; of which mention is made in the words immediately preceding. *As the Father loveth me, says he, so I love you; continue in my love.* 'Ye possess my love at present, continue to possess it.' But here a doubting might arise in their minds, 'How shall we continue to possess it? or how shall we know that we continue to possess it?' To obviate all such exceptions, he adds, 'If ye keep my commandments, ye shall continue to possess my love; as I have kept my Father's commandments, and continue to possess his love.' In the other way explained, besides that the connection is loose, the passage is not so significant. 'If ye keep my commandments, ye will continue to love me.' Better, one would think, 'If ye continue to love me, ye will keep my commandments:' since that is regarded as the cause, this as the effect. Accordingly a good deal is said to this purpose afterwards.

11. *That I may continue to have joy in you, ινα η χαρα η εμη εν υμιν μεινη.* E. T. *That my joy might remain in you.* It is to be observed, that *εν υμιν* is placed betwixt *η χαρα η εμη*, and *μεινη*. I render it as immediately connected with the words preceding, our translators have rendered it as belonging to the word which follows. The former makes a clear and apposite sense, the latter is obscure, not to say mysterious.

16. *It is not you, ουχ υμεις.* Diss. XII. P. I. § 32.

² *That the Father may give you whatsoever ye shall ask him in my name, ινα ο τι αν αιτησητε τον πατερα εν τω ονοματι μου, δω υμιν.* It is an obvious remark, that *δω* is equivocal, as it applies equally to the first person and to the third. Explained in the first person, it runs thus: *that I may give you whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name.* Nonnus explains the words so in his Paraphrase; but the Vul. the Sy. and indeed the whole current of interpreters, have understood the verb as in the third person. This interpretation is also best suited to the scope of the place. I have, therefore, with the other Eng. translators, adopted it here.

18. *It hated me before it hated you, εμε πρωτον υμων μεμισηκεν.* Vul. *Me priorem vobis odio habuit.* The other La. interpreters, if not in the same words, are to the same purpose. So are also the Sy. and other Oriental translations. The M. G. and all the other versions I know, before the present century, express the same sense. Nonnus has so understood the words, who says *πρωτον εμε στυγεσκε.* For, as he has not prefixed the article, and has suppressed the pronoun, his words cannot be otherwise rendered than *it hated me first.* Unless my memory fails me, I may affirm the same thing of ancient commentators as of interpreters. This uniformity of interpretation, where the subject is nowise abstruse, is a strong presumption in its favour. Our Lord was not discussing any sublime question of theology, but giving plain admonitions to patience and constancy, which, it would be strange to imagine, had been so expressed by the Evangelist, as to be universally misunderstood by those expositors who spoke the same language, who lived, I may say, in the neighbourhood, not long after those events; and to be at last discovered in the eighteenth century, by those who, comparatively, are strangers both to the dialect, and to the manners, of the age and country. Yet Dr. Lardner, a very respectable name, I acknowledge, is the first who has defended a different meaning, a meaning which had indeed been hinted, but not adopted, by Be. more than a century before. Lardner supposes *πρωτον* here to be neither adjective nor adverb, but a substantive, of which the proper interpretation is *prince* or *chief.* It is freely owned that the sense which results from this rendering is both good and apposite, yet not more so than the common version. Nothing serves more strongly

to fortify the soul with patience under affliction, than the remembrance of what those whom we esteem, underwent before us. *Πρωτος*, as was formerly observed, (ch. i. 15. ³ N.) is often used substantively for *chief*; that is, first, not in time, but in excellence, rank, or dignity. Some examples of this use were given. But it ought to be remembered, that *πρωτος*, in this application, when it has a regimen, preserves the construction of an adjective in the superlative degree. It is commonly preceded by the article, and is always followed, either by the genitive plural of the noun expressing the subject of comparison, or, if the noun be a collective, by the genitive singular. In like manner, the noun governed includes both the thing compared, and the things to which it is compared. Thus, to say *ὁ πρωτος εστιν ὑμων* he is the chief of you, implies he is one of you; *οἱ πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας* can be applied to none but Galileans, and *οἱ πρωτοι των Ιουδαιων*, to none but Jews. He who is called (Acts, xxviii. 7.) *ὁ πρωτος της νησου*, must have been one of the islanders. If then, our Lord had said *εμε τον πρωτον ἡμων μεμισηκεν*, I should admit the interpretation to be plausible, as the construction is regular, and he himself is included in the *ἡμων*; but the words which the Evangelist represents him as having used, no more express this in Gr. than the words *Jesus was the greatest of the apostles*, would express in Eng. that he was no apostle, but the Lord and Master of the apostles. When Paul calls himself (1 Tim. i. 15.) *πρωτος ἀμαρτωλων* chief of sinners, is he not understood by every body as calling himself a sinner? *The chief of the Levites* (Num. iii. 32.) was certainly a Levite, and *the chief of the singers* (Neh. xii. 46.) was a singer. But are there no exceptions from this rule? I acknowledge that there is hardly a rule in grammar which is not, through negligence, sometimes transgressed, even by good writers: and if any think that such oversights are to be deemed exceptions, I will not dispute about the word. Only, in regard to such exceptions, it will be admitted a good rule for the expounder, never to suppose a violation of syntax, when the words, construed in a different manner, appear regular, and yield an opposite meaning. This I take to be the case in the present instance. That there are examples of such inaccuracy in the use of superlatives, perhaps in all languages, can hardly be denied. Of this I take that quoted from 2 Mac. vii. 41. to be a flagrant example;

εσχατη των υιων η μητηρ ετελευτησε, which is literally, *the mother died last of the sons*. This is of a piece with that of our poet :

Adam the comeliest man of men since born
His sons, the fairest of her daughters Eve.

For my part, I think it much better, in criticising, to acknowledge these to be slips in writing, than to account for them by such supposed enallages, and unnatural ellipses as totally subvert the authority of Syntax, and leave every thing in language vague and indeterminate. The ellipsis of a preposition suggested in the present case is merely hypothetical; for no examples are produced to show, either that *πρωτος* has the meaning ascribed to it, when accompanied with any of the prepositions *εξ*, *προ*, *περι*, or *επι*, supposed to have been dropped; or that it has the meaning without a preposition, when the supposed ellipsis takes place. Yet both of these, especially the latter, appear to be necessary for removing doubt. The only thing that looks like an example of the superlative *πρωτος*, with an exclusive regimen, is that expression Mt. xxvi. 17. *τη πρωτη των αζυμων*, spoken of the day of the passover, which was the fourteenth of the month; though in strictness, the fifteenth was the first of the days of unleavened bread. But for this Dr. Lardner himself has sufficiently accounted, by showing that these two successive festivals, though distinct in themselves, are often, in the Jewish idiom, confounded as one, and that both by the sacred writers and by the historian Josephus. Let it be further observed, that in none of the three places where the phrase in question occurs (to wit, ch. i. 15. 30. and here) is *πρωτος* accompanied with the article which, for the most part, attends the superlative, especially when used for a title of distinction, and more especially still when, as in this place, the article is necessary to remove ambiguity; for *πρωτον* without it, is more properly an adverb, or adverbial preposition, than a noun. Add to all this, that *πρωτος* is not a title which we find any where else in the N. T. either assumed by our Lord, or given to him. This title is indeed in one place (Mt. x. 2.) given to Peter as first of the apostles. Of the propriety of this application there can be no doubt. The attentive reader will observe that the objections here offered against Lardner's interpretation of the clause under review, equally affect his interpretation of the clause *πρωτος μου ην*, ch. i. 15. 30.

20. *If they have observed my word, they will also observe yours, ει τον λογον μου ετηρησαν, και τον υμετερον τηρησουσιν.* E. T. *If they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.* Several critics are of opinion, that the word *τηρειν* is used here in a bad sense for, to watch with an insidious design. But I do not find that the simple verb *τηρειν* ever occurs in this sense in Scripture, though the compound *παρατηρειν* is so used by both Mr. and L. It is also worthy of notice that the phrase *τηρειν τον λογον*, seems to be a favourite expression of the Evangelist John, and is every where else manifestly employed in a good sense: so that if this be an exception, it is the only one. What has been now remarked, makes much more in favour of the common translation, than what has been observed of the words immediately following in verse 21. which imply that all the treatment mentioned had been bad, makes against it: for let it be observed, that the connection is often founded, not on the form of the expression, but on what is suggested by it. Our Lord, by what he here says, recalls to their memories the neglect and contempt with which his doctrine had been treated, and in allusion to which he says, *All this treatment, &c.* I shall only add, that even admitting that there is some ambiguity in the Gr. verb *τηρειν*, it will not surely be thought greater than there is in the Eng. word *observe*, employed in this translation, and sometimes susceptible of an unfavourable meaning.

24. *But now they have seen them, and yet hate both me and my Father, νυν δε και εωρακασι, και μεμισηκασι, και εμε και τον πατερα μου.* E. T. *But now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.* In order to give consistency to the argument which our Lord here uses, we are obliged to consider *αυτα* as understood after *εωρακασι*. All the foreign translations I have seen, whether from the Gr. or from the La. supply the pronoun in this place. Without it, the words convey a very different sense; a sense which is neither so apposite, nor so intelligible.

25. *In their law.* Ch. x. 34. N.

CHAPTER XVI.

2. *Nay the time is coming when—* ἀλλ' ἐρχεται ὥρα ἵνα. E. T. *Yea the time cometh that* — Bishop Pearce would have us read ἀλλ' ἐρχεται ὥρα in a parenthesis, and connect ἵνα with the words which precede, because he thinks that to render ἵνα *when* is scarcely to be justified. But he has not devised any correction, or taken any notice of verse 32. of the same chapter, where the like phrase occurs, ἐρχεται ὥρα και νυν ἐληλυθεν, ἵνα σκορπισθητε, and where the ἵνα, to the conviction of all expositors, denotes *when*. This is a plain Hebraism; their causal conjunction כִּי *chi*, being sometimes used in this sense; an idiom more frequent in J. than in any other penman of the N. T. We have another example of it from him, if I mistake not, in his third Epistle, verse 4th. And this, by the way, is a presumption of the authenticity of that epistle.

2 *Will think he offereth sacrifice to God, δοξη λατρειαν προσφερειν τῷ Θεῷ.* E. T. *Will think he doth God service.* Our translators have here followed the Vul. which has *arbitretur obsequium se præstare Deo.* Er. Zu. Cas. and Be. have done better in substituting *cultum* for *obsequium*. The La. word *obsequium*, and the Eng. word *service*, are too general: *λατρεία* is properly the public service of religion, and when joined as in this place, with *προσφερειν*, can mean only *sacrifice*. It is so rendered in the Sy. version and the Go. Some adages of their rabbies regarding the assassination of the enemies of their religion, show how justly they are here represented by our Lord.

3. *These things they will do, ταυτα ποιησουσιν υμιν.* E. T. *These things they will do unto you.* But *υμιν* is wanting in many MSS. of principal note, as well as in others of less consideration, in the Com. edition, and in that of Ben. in the first Sy. version, the Go. the Sax. and the Ara.; also in some La. MSS. In the 2d Sy. version, it is marked with an asterisk, as of doubtful authority at the best. It seems not to have been admitted by Chr. Cyril, The. or Cyprian. For these reasons I agree with Mill and Wet. in rejecting it.

9. *Concerning sin* ; that is, *their sin*, in rejecting me, whereof the Spirit will give incontestible evidence in the miracles which he will enable my Apostles to perform in my name, and the success with which he will crown their teaching.

10. *Concerning righteousness* ; that is, *my righteousness* or innocence, the justice of my cause (Mt. xxvii. 24. N.) of which the same miraculous power exerted for me by my disciples, will be an irrefragable proof, convincing all the impartial, that I had the sanction of Heaven for what I did and taught, and that, in removing me hence, God hath taken me to himself.

11. *Concerning judgment* ; that is, *divine judgment*, soon to be manifested in the punishment of an incredulous nation, and in defence of the truth.

13. *Into all the truth*, εις πασαν την αληθειαν. E. T. *into all truth*. The article ought not here to have been omitted. It is not omniscience, surely, that was promised, but all necessary religious knowledge. Yet Mr. Wesley's is the only Eng. version I have seen which retains the article.

16. *Within a little while*. Diss. XII. P. I. § 24.

25. *In figures*, εν παροιμιαις. E. T. *In proverbs*. Vul. *In proverbiiis*. Er. and Zu. *Per proverbialia*. Be. *Per similitudines*. Cas. *Oratione figurata*. Παροιμια is used by the Seventy in translating the Heb. מָשָׁל *mashal*, which signifies not only a proverb, but whatever is expressed in figurative or poetical language, as their proverbs commonly were. Thus it is used, ch. x. 6. for a similitude, rendered in the E. T. *a parable*. Here it is manifestly used in all the latitude, implied in the expression employed by Castalio ; that is, for figurative language, not intended to be understood by every body, and perhaps, for a time, not perfectly even by the Apostles themselves.

35. *That any should put questions to thee*, ινα τις σε ερωτα. E. T. *That any man should ask thee*. There are two Gr. verbs not synonymous, used in this context, αιτειν and ερωταν, which are both rendered in the E. T. *ask*. The former answers always to the Eng. word, when it means *to beg*, *to entreat* ; the latter generally, but not always, when it denotes *to put a question*.

As the Eng. verb *ask*, had been used in the former sense in verse 26. answering to *αιτεω*, I thought it better here to use a periphrasis, than to employ the same word for expressing the latter sense in rendering the verb *ερωταω*. Even the slightest appearance of ambiguity should be avoided in the translation, when there can be no doubt concerning the meaning of the original. The purport of the words, therefore, in this place, is, 'Thou knowest us 'so perfectly, and what all our doubts and difficulties are, as renders it unnecessary to apply to thee by questions. Our intentions this way are anticipated by the instructions which thou art 'giving us from time to time.'

CHAPTER XVII.

2. *That he may bestow eternal life on all those whom thou hast given him, ινα παν ο δεδωκας αυτω, δωση αυτοις ζωην αιωνιον.* The words seem capable of being rendered, *that he may give to them all that thou hast given to him, eternal life.* Though this rendering appear at first closer, the common version is in my opinion, preferable. *Παν ο* followed by the pronouns of the third person, in whatever case, number, or gender, is a Hebraism answering to *בל אשר* which may be either singular or plural, and may relate either to persons or things. The pronoun connected as *מנו להם* ascertains the import. Another example of this idiom we have ch. vi. 39. *ινα παν ο δεδωκε μοι, μη απολεσω εξ αυτου.* A like idiom we find, 1 Pet. ii. 24. *ε τω μολωπι αυτου ιαθητε.* Though the Vul. which keeps close to the letter, *ut omne quod dedisti ei, det eis vitam æternam*, seems to favour the second interpretation, father Si. in translating the Vul. considers the Heb. idiom as here so incontrovertible, that, without assigning a reason, in his notes, he renders it *afin qu'il donne la vie éternelle à tous ceux que vous lui avez donnés*; precisely as if the La. had been *ut omnibus illis quos dedisti ei, det vitam æternam.* There would be no propriety in translating the phrase here differently from what it has been always translated ch. vi. 39.

² *Thy apostle*, ch. x. 36. N.

3. *The Messiah.* Dis. V. P. IV. § 7.

5. *Father, glorify thou me in thine own presence, δοξασον με συ,*

πατερ, παρα σεαυτω. E. T. *O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self.* This expression, though apparently more literal, is remarkably obscure. The force of the Gr. preposition παρα, is not rightly expressed by the Eng. *with*, which, as applied here, is exceedingly vague and indeterminate.

11. *Preserve them in thy name, τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου.* E. T. *Keep through thine own name those—* It must be acknowledged that there is some difficulty in the words εν τω ονοματι σου, which I have rendered literally *in thy name*. Name is used in Scripture sometimes for *person*, Rev. iii. 4.; sometimes for *fame*, Ps. lxxvi. 1.; and sometimes, when applied to God, for his *power*, or other perfections, Ps. xx. 1. 7. When mention is made of *making known God's name* to the heathen, we always understand it to mean, declaring to them his nature and attributes, as the only true God. It is solely *to the heathen*, or those who before knew not God, that, in the O. T. we find mention of revealing his name. But let it be observed, that they were Jews of whom our Lord spoke, verse 6th, when he said, *I have made known thy name to the men whom thou hast given me.* The sequel shows, that he meant the Apostles, who, before they became his disciples, were the disciples of Moses. Now, by making known the name of God to those who enjoyed the old dispensation, is plainly suggested, that additional light was conveyed to them, which they could not have derived from it. By manifesting God's name to them, therefore, we must understand the communication of those truths which peculiarly characterize the new dispensation. And as every revelation which God gives, tends further to illustrate the divine character, the instructions which our Lord gave to his disciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of sinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which in the Heb. idiom, is the same) *the name of God* to them. When the connection in this prayer is considered with any degree of attention, we must be sensible that the words, *the name of God*, in verses 6th, 11th, 12th, and 26th, denote the same thing. If, then, by *the name of God*, verses 6th and 26th, be meant the great foundations of the Christian institution, the being preserved or kept in it, verses 11th and 12th, must mean their being enabled to continue in the faith and practice of that religion. Our translators, by rendering εν τω ονοματι σου differently, in verses 11th and 12th, have darkened the ex-

pression, and led the generality of readers into mistakes. *Keep, through thine own name*, can hardly be understood otherwise than as signifying, preserve, by thy power. Similar expressions occur in the Psalms and other places. If verse 11th were the only place in this prayer where mention is made of *the name of God*, I should not deny that this interpretation would have some plausibility. But as that is not the case, we cannot interpret *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι σου* one way in verse 11th, and another way in verse 12th, where it is similarly connected and construed. What is to be remarked in the subsequent note, serves in some degree, to confirm the interpretation now given. I own the Eng. word *name* hardly admits this latitude of acceptation. But it was observed (Diss. XII. P. V. § 12.), that we are obliged sometimes, in order to avoid tiresome circumlocutions, to admit an application of particular terms, which is not entirely warranted by use. When there is a difficulty (for it is only of such cases I am speaking,) there is this advantage in tracing the words of the original, that the sense of the sacred writer is not arbitrarily confined by the opinions of the translator, but is left in the text, as nearly as possible, in the same extent, to the judgment of the reader.

² *Which thou hast given me, οὗς δέδωκας μοι.* E. T. *Whom thou hast given me.* But there is a great majority of MSS. and, among them, those of principal consideration, which reject the word *οὗς* in this place. A few substitute *ὁ* in its room, but the much greater number have *ὁ*. In either way, the meaning is the same with that given in this version. The relative in Gr. often takes the case of the antecedent, and not always, as in La. the case that is governed by the verb with which it is connected. For reading *ὁ*, there is also the authority of the Com. both the Sy. translations, and the Ara. Of the fathers, there are Athanasius, Cyril, The. and Euth.; likewise many modern critics; amongst whom are, Ham. Mill, and Wet. Add to this, that such a mistake as the change of *ὁ*, into *οὗς*, in this place, is easily accounted for: *οὗς δέδωκας μοι* occurs in the very next verse. It is incident to transcribers, either through inadvertency in directing their eye, or through suspicion of mistake in the former copier, to make expressions of the author, which are nearly the same, entirely so. Besides, the meaning of *οὗς δέδωκας* is more obvious than that of *ὁ δέδωκας*, which might readily lead a transcriber to consider the latter as a mere blunder in copying. But if the

word was originally οὐς, it is not easily to be accounted for, that it should have been so generally corrected into φ', and the like correction on verses 6th and 12th not attempted. It may be observed in passing, that this reading does not a little confirm the sense I have given to the word *name*, through the whole of this passage. If, by the name here, be meant the Gospel revelation, nothing can be more conformable to the tenor of our Lord's whole discourse on this occasion; this revelation was given by the Father to his Son, to be by him communicated to the world.

³ *That they may be one, as we are, ἵνα ὡσιν ἓν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς.* The word is here ἓν, *one thing*; not εἷς, *one person*. Ch. x. 30. N.

13. *That their joy in me may be complete, ἵνα ἐχωσι τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς.* E. T. *That they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.* What meaning our translators affixed to these words, I cannot say; but the whole scope and connection make it evident, that ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ denotes, here, not the joy which I have (the only sense which the words *my joy* will bear in Eng.) but the joy whereof I am the object, the joy they will derive from me. Beau. seems to have been the first modern interpreter who rendered the words intelligibly, *afin qu'ils goutent en moi une joie parfaite*; and the only one in Eng. the An.

17. *By the truth, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου.* E. T. *Through thy truth.* The pronoun is not in some principal MSS. nor in the Vul. the Go. and the Sax. versions. Cyril seems not to have read it; and Ben. and Mill reject it. It is very unnecessary here, as the explanation subjoined, *thy word is the truth*, sufficiently appropriates it.

24. *Father, I would, πατέρ, θελω.* E. T. *Father, I will.* Θελω expresses no more than a petition, a request. It was spoken by our Lord in prayer to his heavenly Father, to whom he was obedient, even unto death. But the words *I will*, in Eng. when *will* is not the sign of the future, express rather a command. The La. *volo*, though not so uniformly as the Eng. *I will*, admits the same interpretation; and, therefore, Beza's manner here, who renders the word used by John, *velim*, is much preferable to that of the Vul. Er. Zu. and Cas. who say, *volo*. That the sense of the Gr. word is, in the N. T. as I have represented it, the critical reader may soon satisfy himself, by consulting the following passages

in the original : Mt. xii. 38. xxvi. 39. Mr. vi. 25. x. 35. In some of these, the verb is rendered *would*, by our translators ; it ought to have been rendered so in them all, as they all manifestly imply request, not command. In most of the late Eng. translations, this impropriety is corrected. Dod. and Wes. have, indeed, retained the words *I will* ; nay, more, have made them the foundation of an argument (one in his Paraphrase, the other in his Notes), that what follows *I will*, is not so properly a petition, as a claim of right. But this argument is built on an Anglicism in their translations, for which the sacred author is not accountable. Augustine, in like manner, founding on a Latinism, argued from the word *volo* of the Itc. version, as a proof of the equality of the Father and the Son. He is very well answered by Be. whose sentiments on this subject, are beyond suspicion. See his note on the place. The sons of Zebedee also use the word *θελομεν*, Mr. x. 35. in making a request to Jesus ; but it would be doing great injustice to the two disciples to say, either that they claimed, as their right, what they then asked, or that they called themselves equal to their lord and master. Calvin, speaking of those who, in support of the trinity of persons in the godhead, argued that Moses, in his account of the creation, joins *elohim* (a word signifying God), in the plural number, to the verb *bara* (created), in the singular, advises very properly, “*Monendi sunt lectores ut sibi a violentis ejusmodi glossis caveant*” (Comment. in Gen. i. 1.). I shall conclude this note with the words of Cas. (Defensio, &c.): “*Ego veritatem velim veris argumentis defendi, non ita ridiculis, quibus deridenda propinetur adversariis.*”

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. *Over the brook Kidron*, *περὸν τοῦ χειμαρροῦ τῶν Κεδρων.*
 E. T. *Over the brook Cedron.* The Al. MS. alone, reads *τοῦ Κεδρων.* The majority of modern critics agree with Jerom in thinking, that this, which suits the Vul. *trans torrentem Cedron*, is the genuine reading ; a remarkable instance wherein the internal evidence is more than a counterbalance to numerous testimonies, or strong external evidence on the opposite side. *Kidron* is, in Heb.

the name of a brook near Jerusalem, of which mention is several times made in the historical books of the O. T. The name, when written in Gr. characters, coincides with the genitive plural of the appellative *κεδρος*, a cedar. The transcribers of the N. T. were (with very few, if any, exceptions) Greeks or Latins, who knew nothing of Heb. Such, finding the singular article *του* joined with the plural *κεδρων*, would naturally impute it to inadvertency, arising from hurry in transcribing. In consequence of this notion, *του* would readily be changed into *των*, by all who chose to have their copies clear from flagrant blunders. This so perfectly, and with so much natural probability, accounts for the change of *του* and *των*, both here, and in some places of the Sep. as, in my judgment, greatly preponderates all the MSS. and versions in the opposite scale. Most interpreters since Jerom's time, that is, since the introduction of the study of Oriental literature into the West, have thought so likewise. It may be remarked also, that this is one of the few passages in which the Eng. translators have preferred the reading of the Vul. though unsupported, to the almost universal reading of the Gr. the proper version of which is *the brook of Cedars*. My reason for saying *Kidron*, I have assigned above. Diss. XII. P. III. § 6, &c.

11. *Put up the sword*, *Βαλε την μαχαίραν σου*. E. T. *Put up thy sword*. But the pronoun is wanting in most of the MSS. of principal account, and a great many others. It is neither in the Com. edition, nor in that of Ben. It is not in either Sy. Go. Cop. or Arm. versions. Nonnus, who says simply, *κολεω τε τιθει ξιφος*, seems not to have read it. Will and Wet. reject it.

15. *And another disciple*, *και ο αλλος μαθητης*. This is another instance wherein our translators have preferred the reading of the Vul. to that of the common Gr. The Vul. says, *et alius discipulus*. The only authorities from MSS. for this reading, are the Al. the Cam. and another of less note; all which omit the article. Wet. mentions no versions which favour it, except the Vul. and the Go. It is surprising that he does not mention the Sy. which expresses exactly the sense of the Vul. in this manner, *and one of the other disciples*. It was impossible in that language, which has no articles, to show more explicitly that, in their original, the expression was indefinite. The Sax. version also says *another*. This renders it very probable, that it was so in the Old

Itc. Nonnus too expresses it indefinitely, *και νεος αλλος εταιρος*. On the whole, however, if it were not for that evidence which results from connection, the scope of the place, and the ordinary laws of composition, I should not lay great stress on all that can be pleaded in its favour from positive testimony.

20. *Whither the Jews constantly resort, οπου παντοθεν οι Ιουδαιοι συνηρχονται*. E. T. *Whither the Jews always resort*. This is the third example in this chapter (so many will not be found in all the rest of the Gospel) wherein our translators, whom I have copied in these instances, have deserted the common Gr. Here, however, they have adopted a reading vouched by the plurality of MSS. though unsupported either by the Vul. or by the Sy. Beside MSS. the Com. and some other valuable editions, read *παντοτε*. This reading is favoured also by the Go. and second Sy. and by some of the Gr. fathers. *Παντες* is supported by the Al. and several other MSS. some early editions, with the Vul. 1st Sy. Cop. Arm. Sax. and Eth. versions. Be. in his edition, whence the common editions are derived, has put *παντοθεν*, giving his reason in the Notes, in these words: "in vetustis codicibus legimus *παντοτε*: "ego verò existimo, vel legendum *παντες*, vel *παντοθεν*, quod "facile potuit a librariis mutari in *παντοτε*." Wet. after these words which he quotes, subjoins, very properly, "et ita quidem, "quod mireris, contra omnes codices edidit." I shall add, as what appears to me still more surprising, that Beza's "ego verò existimo," enforced merely by his own example, should, with so many modern editors, and some translators, prove more than a counterpoise to all the authorities of MSS. and versions which can be pleaded against it.

28. *To eat the passover*. Ch. xiv. 14. N.

31. *We are not permitted, ημιν ουκ εξεστιν*. Whether the power of judging, in capital cases, was taken from them by the Romans, or was, in effect, as Lightfoot has rendered very probable, (Hor. Heb. Mt. xxvi. 3. J. xviii. 31.) abandoned by themselves, is not material. The resumption of a power which has long gone into disuse, is commonly dangerous, sometimes impracticable. What is never done, is everywhere considered, as what cannot legally be done.

37. *Thou art king then? Ουζουν βασιλευς ει συ; E. T. Art thou a king then?* As to the form of the interrogation, see the pa-

rallel passage in Mt.; as to the expression βασιλευς ει, though it be not so definite, and, consequently, so emphatical, as if it had the article; it is not, on the other hand, so indefinite as it is in the E. T. by being rendered *a king*. This would never have been said of one who claimed to be king of the country, which was, doubtless, Pilate's view of our Lord's pretensions. The expression, *a king*, on the contrary, suggests the notion of foreign dominions. The import of the original is sufficiently expressed in our language, by the omission of the definite article, a thing not uncommon in conversation; and the more natural here, as the words are a repetition of what had been expressed more fully, verse 33. For I have had occasion to observe before, that such ellipses are often adopted in repeating phrases which have but very lately occurred. Ch. xix. 12. N.

40. *Then they all cried, εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν παντες.* E. T. *Then cried they all again.* The word παλιν is wanting in a considerable number of MSS. in the Com. edition, the Sy. Cop. Sax. Ara. Arm. and Eth. versions. In many La. MSS. it is not found. Besides, it does not suit the preceding part of our Lord's trial, as related by this Evangelist, who makes no mention of their crying in this manner before.

CHAPTER XIX.

2. *A purple mantle, ιματιον πορφυρου.* It is called, Mt. xxvii. 28. *a scarlet cloak, χλαμυδα κοκκινην.* The names denoting the colour of the garment, ought to be understood with all the latitude common in familiar conversation. This cloak, in strictness, may have been neither purple nor scarlet, and yet have had so much of each, as would naturally lead one to give it one of these names, and another the other.

12. *Whoever calleth himself king, πας ο βασιλευς αυτον ποιων.* E. T. *Whosoever maketh himself a king.* That the verb ποιειν here means no more than *to call*, is evident from verse 7th. We have, in this verse, an example of what was observed on ch. xviii. 37. The sentence whereof these words are a part, is true, when βασιλευς is rendered *king*, but not when rendered *a king*. Judea,

at that time, together with Syria, to which it was annexed, made a province of the empire. Nothing more certain, than that whoever, in Judea, called himself *king*, in the sense wherein the word was commonly understood, opposed Cæsar ; for if the kingdom to which he laid claim, was without the bounds of the Roman empire, the title nowise interfered with the rights of the emperor. So much does the significance of a sentence sometimes depend on what would be thought a very minute circumstance.

14. *Now it was the preparation of the paschal-sabbath, ην δε παρασκευη του πασχα.* E. T. *And it was the preparation of the passover.* The word *παρασκευη*, in the N. T. denotes always in my opinion, the day before the Sabbath. My reasons for this opinion are as follows: 1st, The explanation now given, coincides exactly with the definition which Mr. gives of that word, ch. xv. 42. *ην παρασκευη ο εστι προσαββατον.* *It was the preparation, that is, the eve of the Sabbath.* 2dly, The word occurs six times in the N. T.; and, in all these places, confessedly means the sixth day of the week, answering to our Friday, and consequently before the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday. 3dly, The preparation of all things necessary the day before the Sabbath, that they might be under no temptation to violate the sabbatical rest, was expressly commanded in the law. Ex. xvi. 5. 23. There was nothing analagous to this enjoined in preparation for the other feasts. But it may be objected, that, in the passage under consideration, the expression is *παρασκευη του πασχα.* To this it has been answered, and I think justly, that the word *πασχα* was not always confined to the sacrifice of the lamb or the kid, appointed to be on the fourteenth of the month Nisan, at even ; but was often extended to the whole of the festival, which began with the paschal sacrifice, properly so called, and continued the seven days of unleavened bread which immediately followed. The whole time is called indifferently, sometimes *the feast of the passover*, sometimes *the feast of unleavened bread*. In further confirmation of this, it has been observed, that other sacrifices offered during that period, were sometimes termed *the passover*. Deut. xvi. 2. it is said, *thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd.* Now, the last term, *the herd*, could only relate to the other sacrifices presented during the seven days which succeeded, and not to the signal commemorative

sacrifice called, by way of eminence, *the passover*, with which the festival was introduced; for, as to it, it could be taken only from the flock. Nor does the argument rest on this single passage. In 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9. *bullocks* (which are there improperly rendered *oxen*) are mentioned as passover offerings, in the same way with *lambs* and *kids*. Now, if the whole period, and the sacrifices offered therein, were sometimes familiarly called the passover, it is extremely probable that the Sabbath of the passover-week should, in the same way, be distinguished from other Sabbaths, especially as it appears to have been considered by them as a day peculiarly memorable. Thus, verse 31st, the Evangelist tells us, that *that Sabbath* (he is speaking of the day after our Lord's crucifixion) *was a great day*. I have, therefore, for the sake of perspicuity, rendered the word *πασχα* here, *paschal-sabbath*. This serves also to account for what we are told, ch. xviii. 28. that the Jews *entered not the pretorium, lest they should be defiled, and so not in a condition to eat the passover*. If we suppose (and, in this supposition, there is surely nothing incongruous) that the Evangelist used the word in the same latitude that Moses and the writer of the Chronicles did, in the passages above quoted, the whole difficulty vanishes. No more is meant by *eating the passover*, than partaking in the sacrifices offered during the days of unleavened bread, which the rabbies have since distinguished by the name *chagiga*. Others have attempted to remove these difficulties by supposing that our Lord anticipated the legal time, that he might have an opportunity of eating the passover before his death; a thing extremely improbable in every view. It does not suit the circumstances of the story, as related by Mt. Mr. and L. (for, as to this, J. is silent), who all speak of it just as men would speak of a festival, celebrated at the known and stated time, and in the usual manner, and not in a way singular and irregular. Further, there is no omission of duty in not celebrating an anniversary which one does not live to see: but in anticipating the time, there would have been a real transgression of the commandment, which expressly confined the observance to the fourteenth day of the month, permitting no change of the day, except in a particular case of uncleanness, which is not pretended to have taken place here; and in which case the choice of another day is not left open, but the time is fixed to the fourteenth of the ensuing month. Add to

this that, in such an anticipation of the sacrifice, the concurrence of some of the priesthood would have been necessary (see 2 Chr. xxx. 15, 16, 17. xxxv. 11.), which, we have reason to believe, could not have been obtained. To obviate these objections, distinctions have been devised, of which we find not a vestige in Scripture, or in the writings of the rabbies. Such is that of Gro. between the paschal sacrifice and the paschal commemoration. The latter he supposes our Lord to have solemnized, but not the former. A manner of solving difficulties, so hypothetical, and so fanciful, as it offers no evidence, needs no confutation. Those who choose to see a fuller discussion of this matter may consult Lightfoot *Horæ Heb. on Mr.* xiv. 12. and J. xviii. 28 or Whitby's Appendix to the fourteenth chapter of Mr.

² *About the sixth hour, ὥρα δε ὡσεὶ ἕκτη.* As this does not perfectly accord with Mr. (xv. 25.), who says, *it was the third hour when they nailed him to the cross*, such an appearance of contradiction could not fail to be soon observed; and the observation has not failed of producing the usual effect—the correction of one Gospel by another. Accordingly, the Cam. MS. reads *τριη*; but little regard is due to this, if Wetstein's remark be just, that the leaf is not written by the hand which wrote the rest of the MS. but appears, from the character, to be of a much later date. Certain it is, that, in the La. translation wherewith that copy is accompanied, the word is *sexta*. There are only three other MSS. of little account, which read *τριη*. Nonnus also has read thus: but not one of the ancient translators. Eusebius, and, after him, other Gr. commentators, favour this reading. Dod. in his Paraphrase, adopts it, though he translates the words in the common way. He supports his opinion, in a note, from a passage found in a fragment of Peter of Alexandria; concerning which, Wet. observes, that Petavius has shown that Peter was not the author. The common hypothesis is, that some early transcriber has mistaken the Ϛ, the numeral mark for 3, for the Ϝ, the mark for 6; and thus has substituted *ἕκτη* instead of *τριη*. Others suppose that J. speaks of the condemnation of Jesus, Mr. of the crucifixion; that J. reckons the hours as we do, and means 6 in the morning; Mr. speaks in the Jewish manner, and means 9; and that, consequently, three hours intervened between the sentence and the execution. Abstracting from other improbabil-

ities in this account, it is manifest, from several places of this Gospel, ch. i. 39. iv. 6. 52. that J. like all the other evangelists, reckoned the hours in the Jewish manner. Harmer's solution (Vol. 3. Obs. 40.) that "it was the sixth hour, not of the day, but of the preparation of the passover peace-offerings," does not satisfy. When the historian said, *Ἦν δὲ παρασκευῆ*, *It was the preparation*, he plainly named, and has been always understood to name, the day of the week. Now it is well known that the whole Friday was so called, without regard to the time actually spent in preparation. Nor is there ground to think that there was any allusion to the passover peace-offerings. It was the preparation requisite for the due observance of the sabbath, which alone occasioned this name being given to the day. Had the preparation necessary for the sacrifices given ground for this appellation, every day had been a *paraskeue*, as every day, more especially every festival, there were sacrifices. Now it is evident that the name *paraskeue* among the Jews, was as much appropriated to the sixth day of the week, as the name *sabbath* was to the seventh. Mr. gives us *προσαββατον* as a synonymous term. For my part, I prefer the solution (though it may be accounted but an imperfect one) given by those who consider the day as divided into four parts, answering to the four watches of the night. These coincided with the hours of 3, 6, 9, and 12, or, in our way of reckoning, 9, 12, 3, and 6, which suited also the solemn times of sacrifice and prayer in the temple; that, in cases wherein they did not think it of consequence to ascertain the time with great accuracy, they did not regard the intermediate hours, but only those more noted divisions which happened to come nearest the time of the event spoken of. Mr. says, *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη*; from which we have reason to conclude, that *the third hour* was past. J. says, *ὥρα ὡσεὶ ἕκτη*; from which I think it probable, that *the sixth hour* was not yet come. On this supposition, though the Evangelists may, by a fastidious reader, be accused of want of precision in regard to dates, they will not by any judicious and candid critic, be charged with falsehood or misrepresentation. Who would accuse two modern historians with contradicting each other, because, in relating an event which had happened between 10 and 11 forenoon, one had said it was past 9 o'clock; the other, it was drawing towards noon?

23. *His mantle, τα ἱματῖα αὐτοῦ.* Ch. xiii. 4. N.

25. *Mary, the wife of Cleophas, Μαρια ἡ τοῦ Κλωπα.* The Ara. version renders it, *Mary, the daughter of Cleophas.* The original expression is susceptible of either interpretation. Mt. i. 6. N. I have followed the generality of interpreters, who think that Cleophas here is another name for him called Alpheus. Mt. x. 3.

29. *Having fastened it to a twig of hyssop, ὑσσωπῷ περιθεντες.* There must have been some plant in Judea of the lowest class of trees or shrubs, which was either a species of hyssop, or had a strong resemblance to what the Greeks called ὑσσωπος; inasmuch as the Hellenist Jews always distinguished it by that name. Indeed, the Gr. word, if we may judge from its affinity in sound, is probably derived from the Heb. name עֲזֹב, *ezob*. It is said of Solomon, 1 Ki. iv. 33. that *he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall.* Now, they did not reckon among trees any plants but such as had durable and woody stalks. (See N. on Mt. vi. 30.) That their *hyssop* was of this kind, is evident, also, from the uses of sprinkling, to which it is, in many cases, appointed by the law to be applied.

30. *Yielded up his spirit, παρεδωκε το πνευμα.* Mt. xxvii. 30. N.

40. *Which is the Jewish manner of embalming, καθως εθος εστι τοις Ιουδαιοις ενταγιαζειν.* E. T. *As the manner of the Jews is to bury.* But the proper meaning of the verb *ενταγιαζειν* is not *to bury*, but *to embalm*, or to prepare the body for burial—*pollincire, corpus ad sepulturam componere.* The Vul. indeed, renders the clause *sicut mos est Judaeis sepelire*, which is the real source of the error in modern translations. Suffice it to observe here, that the verb *ενταγιαζειν*, and the verbal noun *ενταγιασμος*, are used in the N. T. only in relation to the embalming of the body of our Lord. The word used for *to bury*, is invariably *θαπτειν*. The use followed by the Sep. is entirely similar: *ενταγιαζειν* is *to prepare the corpse*; *θαπτειν* is *to bury*. The import of both words, and, consequently, the distinction between them, is exemplified, Gen. 1. 2. 5. In verse 2d, *προσεταξεν Ιωσηφ τοις παισιν αὐτοῦ τοις ενταγιασταις ενταγιασαι τον πατερα αὐτου, και ενταγιασαν οἱ ενταγιασται τον Ισραηλ.* E. T. *Joseph commanded his servants, the physicians, to embalm his father; and the physicians embalmed Israel.* Whereas, in verse 5th, Joseph's words to Pharaoh

are—Ὁ πατήρ μου ὄρκισε με, λεγων, Ἐν τῷ μνημειῷ ᾧ ὠρυξά
 εμαυτῷ ἐν γῆ Χανααν, ἐκεῖ με θαφῆις· νῦν οὖν ἀναβας, θαψῶ
 τὸν πατέρα μου. E. T. *My father made me swear, saying, "In my
 "grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt
 "thou bury me." Now, therefore, let me go up, I pray thee, and bury
 my father.* Here the difference between the two verbs is distinctly
 marked. The former, *το ενταγιαζειν*, was the work of *the physi-
 cians*, according to the import of the Heb. term, or of *the embalmers*,
 according to the Gr.; the latter, *το θαπτειν*, was the work of Jo-
 seph, and the company who attended him: the former was execu-
 ted in Egypt, the latter in Canaan. Let it be observed further, that
 the two Gr. words are the translation of two Heb. words, which
 are never used promiscuously, or mistaken for each other. In
 this passage, which is the only place wherein the Seventy have
 used the verb *ενταγιαζειν*, the Vul. has carefully preserved the
 distinction. It renders *ενταγιαζειν*, *aromatibus condire*, and *θαπ-
 τειν*, *sepelire*. To a judicious Eng. reader, who considers the
 vast quantity of the most costly aromatics which, the Evangelist
 tells us, were bestowed by Nicodemus on the body of our Lord,
 the clause subjoined, *as the manner of the Jews is to bury*, must
 have a very strange appearance. The first reflection that would
 naturally arise in his mind would be, 'If so, surely not one of a
 'hundred of the people could afford to be buried.' Yet certain
 it is, that no nation was more careful than the Jewish, to bury
 their dead, though, very probably, not one of a hundred was em-
 balmed. But it had been predicted of our Lord, not only that
 he should be numbered with *transgressors* (malefactors), not
 only that his grave should be appointed with the wicked (which
 was the case of those who suffered, as criminals, by public jus-
 tice; Nicolai de Sepulchris Hebraeorum, Lib. III Cap. V.); but
 that he should be joined with the rich in his death; circumstan-
 ces which, before they happened, it was very improbable, should
 ever concur in the same person.—L. Cl. and Si. are the only
 French translators who seem to have been sensible of the proper
 meaning of *ενταγιαζειν*. The former says, *selon la coutume que les
 Juifs ont de preparer les corps pour les ensevelir*; the latter, *com-
 me le pratiquent les Juifs avant que d' ensevelir leurs morts*. The
 late Eng. translations follow implicitly the common version.

CHAPTER XX.

1. *Saw that the stone had been removed.* Βλεπει τον λιθον ηρημενον. E. T. *Seeth the stone taken away.* The import of this Eng. expression is that she was present at the removing of the stone. The Gr. plainly implies that it had been removed before she came; ηρημενον is not the present but the preter-perfect participle. The Vul. *vidit lapidem sublatus*, where the word is equivocal, has misled our Interpreters. The La. has not like the Gr. distinct participles for the present and for the past. None of the Eng. translations I have seen, except the An. Dod. and Hey. have escaped this blunder. None of the Fr. Catholic or protestant, have fallen into it. Lu. in Ger. has avoided it, so has Dio. in Ita.

8. *Believed [the report],* επιστευσε. E. T. *Believed.* It naturally occurs here to ask what? The active verb *believe*, in our language, requires, in every case, where it is not manifest from the preceding words, the addition of the thing believed. Was this in the present instance, our Lord's resurrection? No: that had not yet been reported to him, or so much as insinuated. Mary Magdalene had affirmed only that the body had been carried off, and that she knew not where they had laid it. Besides, we learn, from what immediately follows, that our Lord's first appearance to her (and to her the Evangelist Mr. informs us, xvi. 9. that he appeared first of all) was after the two disciples had left the place. The ellipsis here, therefore, is most naturally supplied by the words *the report*, to wit, that made by Mary above recited, which had occasioned the visit made at that time to the sepulchre, by the two disciples. The Cam. MS. reads *επιστευσεν*. But in this that MS. is singular, not having the support of any MS. or version. Even the La. translation, with which it is accompanied, has no negative particle.

10. *To their companions,* προς εαυτους. E. T. *Unto their own home.* The words are capable of either interpretation; but I have, with Dod. adopted the former, as it suits better what is related both by this, and by the other Evangelists; from all of whom we learn that our Lord's disciples spent much of this day together.

17. *Lay not hands on me, Μη μου άπτου.* E. T. *Touch me not.* The verb άπτεσθαι in the use of the Seventy, denotes not only *to touch*, but *to lay hold on, to cleave to*, as in Job xxxi. 7. Ezek. xli. 6. and other places. The sense here plainly is, ‘Do not detain me at present. The time is precious. Lose not a moment, therefore, in carrying the joyful tidings of my resurrection to my disciples.’

19. *Jesus came where the disciples were convened, the doors having been shut for fear of the Jews, και των θυρων κεκλεισμενων, όπου ησαν οι μαθηται συνελημενοι, δια τον φοβον των Ιουδαιων, ηλθεν ο Ιησους.* E. T. *When the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus.* This arrangement does not well in English: if it do not suggest a false meaning, it at least renders the true meaning obscure. The disciples assembled, but surely not for fear of the Jews; for, as they did not intend by violence to oppose violence, if any should be offered them, they could not but know that to assemble themselves would more expose them to danger than any other measure they could take. The plain matter is; they assembled for mutual advice and comfort, and being assembled, the doors were shut for fear of the Jews, as they were well aware of the consequence of being discovered at such a time, in consultation together. On the other hand, the words do not necessarily imply, that, whilst the doors continued shut, our Lord entered miraculously. *Κεκλεισμενων* is even more literally rendered *having been shut*, than *being shut*, or *when they were shut*; as it is the preterperfect, not the present or imperfect participle. They may have been, therefore, for aught related by the Evangelist, made by miracle to fly open and give him access.

25. *Put my finger into the print of the nails, βαλω τον δακτυλον μου εις τον τυπον των ηλων.* Vul. *Mittam digitum meum in locum clavorum.* The Al. and four other MSS. have *τοπον* for *τυπον*. The Sy. as well as the Vul. and Sax. follows this reading. The sense is the same.

27. *Be not incredulous, but believe, μη γινου απιστος, αλλα πιστος.* E. T. *Be not faithless, but believing.* The word *faithless* is here used in a sense in which it is now obsolete. Both the Gr. words *πιστος* and *απιστος*, in this passage, are to be under-

stood as merely Hellenistical for *credens* and *non credens*, a sense in which they frequently occur in the N. T. See Acts x. 45. xvi. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13, 14. 1 Tim. iv. 3. 10. 12. v. 16. vi. 2. In these commonly the meaning has been justly exhibited by interpreters. In rendering Gal. iii. 9. *ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογούνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ*, our translators have been rather unlucky in an expression which, if not improper at the time, was, at least equivocal, and darkened the sense. *So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.* The connection here appears more in the sound than in the sense. Properly, *They, therefore, who believe, are blessed with Abraham who believed.*

30, 31. *Many other miracles, &c.* Grotius is of opinion that this Gospel concludes with these two verses, and that the following chapter has been afterwards annexed by the church of Ephesus, in like manner as the last chapter of the pentateuch, and the last of Josephus have, after the death of the authors, been added by the sanhedrim. His reasons are, 1. The resemblance which this bears to the conclusion of the next chapter, v. 24, 25. 2. The designation of the author there by the 3d person sing. *his testimony.* 3. The application that is made of the 1st person plur. *We know.* In regard to the first, it has been justly observed, that, with equal reason, the three last verses of the epistle to the Romans may be accounted spurious. As to the other two, suffice it to observe, that it is not uncommon in the apostle John, to speak of himself either in the 3d person sing. (as in ch. xiii. 23, &c. xviii. 15, 16. xix. 26, 27. 35. xx. 2, &c.) or in the 1st person plur. (as in ch. i. 14. 16. 1 Jo. i. 1, 2, &c.) This notion of Gro. deserves, therefore, to be rated as merely a modern conjecture opposed to the testimony of all ecclesiastical antiquity, MSS. editions, versions, commentaries, which uniformly attest the last chapter, as much as any other in the book.

CHAPTER XXI.

7. *Girt on his upper garment, τὸν ἐπενδυτὴν διεξώσατο.* E. T. *He girt his fisher's coat unto him.* *Ἐπενδυτῆς*, agreeably to its etymology from *ἐπενδυω*, *super induo*, signifies an upper garment. It occurs in no other place of the N. T.; but, from the use the Seventy have made of it in the Old, there is no reason to confine

the meaning to the garb of any particular profession, or even to that of either sex. In one of the only two places wherein it occurs in the Sep. (1 Sam. xviii. 4.) it is used for the robe or loose upper garment worn by Jonathan the son of Saul; in the other (2 Sam. xiii. 18.) for that worn by the virgin daughters of the king. I cannot approve, therefore, the Vul. Er. and Leo de Juda, for rendering it *tunica*; nor Cas. who translates it *indusium*. I think Be. has done better in making it *amiculum*.

² Which he had laid aside, *ἦν γὰρ γυμνός*. E. T. For he was naked. But *γυμνός* does not always like the Eng. word *naked*, signify having no clothes on, or being totally uncovered, but not having all the clothes usually worn, particularly not having his mantle. In this sense the word seems to be used, Acts xix. 16. and in several passages of the O. T.

12. Come and dine, *δευτε, αριστησατε*. Vul. Er. Zu. Be. *Venite, prandete*. Cas. *Adeste prandete*. Dod. *Come and refresh yourselves*. Wy. *Come, eat*. Bishop Pearce approves rather, *Come and breakfast*, because it was early, as we learn from verse 4. The same is the reason with the other two Eng. interpreters for departing from the common method. I do not think it a good reason. The ancients used regularly but two meals, we use three. As of our three, dinner and supper have been regarded as the two principal, it has obtained not only with us, but, I believe, over all Europe, to call the first meal of the ancients, which the Greeks named *το αριστον*, and the Latins *prandium*, by the first of the two, which is *dinner*, and the second, *το δειπνον* of the Greeks, and *cæna* of the Latins, by the last, which is *supper*. It is the order that has fixed the names, and not the precise time of the day at which they were eaten. This is commonly variable, and the names cannot be gradually altered with the fashions, much less can they be accommodated to every occasional convenience. Our ancestors dined at eleven forenoon, and supped at five afternoon. But it will not be thought necessary that we should call the breakfast of our fashionable people dinner, and their dinner supper, because they coincide in time with those meals of their progenitors. To introduce the name *breakfast* would but mislead by giving a greater appearance of similarity in their manners to our own, than fact will justify. *Refresh yourselves* is a very vague expression.

² *None of the disciples, ουδεις των μαθητων.* Vul. *Nemo discumbentium*, doubtless from some copy which has read *ανακειμενων*. In this the Vul. has only the concurrence of the Sax. version.

³ *Ventured to ask him, ετολμα εξετασαι αυτον.* E. T. *Durst ask him.* An. and Hey. say *Offered.* Dod. Wes. Wor. and Wy. *Presumed.* Priestley, *thought it necessary.* Bishop Pearce has justly remarked concerning the verb *τολμαω* followed by an infinitive, that it does not always, in the use of Gr. authors, sacred or profane, express the boldness or courage implied in the Eng. verb *to dare*, by which it is commonly rendered. But it is equally true, on the other hand, that it is not a mere expletive. When joined with a negative, as in this place, it often expresses a disinclination arising from modesty, delicacy, respect, or an averseness to be troublesome in putting unnecessary questions. The words immediately following, *knowing that it was the master*, confirm the interpretation now given. The common version, *durst not*, tends to convey the notion, that our Lord's manner of conversing with his disciples was harsh and forbidding, than which nothing can be more contrary to truth. *Did not presume*, is better, as it does not suggest any austerity in our Lord; but it plainly implies what is not implied in the words: that, in the historian's judgment, there would have been presumption in putting the question. The word *offered* is a mere expletive. *Thought it necessary*, though yielding an apposite meaning in this place, is evidently not the meaning of *ετολμα*. The terms *ventured not*, in my opinion, come up entirely to the sense of the author; which is, to express a backwardness proceeding from no other fear than that which may be the consequence of the most perfect esteem and veneration. When those spoken of are either enemies or indifferent persons, the verb *ετολμα* may not improperly be rendered *presumed* or *durst*. But that is not the case here. See Mr. xii. 34. N.

15. *Lovest thou me more than these? αγαπας με πλειον τουτων;* There is an ambiguity here in the original, which, after the Eng. translators, I have retained in the version. It may either mean, *Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these things?* that is, thy boats, nets, and other implements of fishing, by which thou earnest a livelihood? or, *Lovest thou me more than these men* [thy fellow-disciples] *love me?* In the first way interpreted, the

question is neither so cold nor so foreign, as some have represented it. This was probably the last time that Peter exercised his profession as a fisherman. Jesus was about to employ him as an apostle; but as he disdained all forced obedience, and would accept no service that did not spring from choice, and originate in love, he put this question to give Peter an opportunity of professing openly his love, which his late transgression had rendered questionable, and consequently his preference of the work in which Jesus was to employ him, with whatever difficulties and perils it might be accompanied, to any wordly occupation, however gainful. In the other way interpreted, the question must be considered as having a reference to the declaration formerly made by Peter, when he seemed to arrogate a superiority above the rest, in zeal for his Master, and steadiness in his service. *Though thou shouldst prove a stumbling-stone to them all* (says he; Mt. xxvi. 33.) *I never will be made to stumble.* This gives a peculiar propriety to Peter's reply here. Convinced at length that his Master knew his heart better than he himself, conscious at the same time, of the affection which he bore him, he dares make the declaration, appealing to the infallible Judge before whom he stood, as the voucher of his truth. But, as to his fellow-disciples, he is now taught not to assume in any thing. He dares not utter a single word which would lead to a comparison with those to whom, he knew, his woful defection had made him appear so much inferior. To the second interpretation I know it is objected, that our Lord cannot be supposed to ask Peter a question, which the latter was not in a capacity to answer: for, though he was conscious of his own love, he could have no certain knowledge of the love of others. But to this it may be justly answered, that such questions are not understood to require an answer from knowledge, but from opinion. Peter had once shown himself forward enough to obtrude his opinion unasked, to the disadvantage of the rest, compared with himself. His silence now on that part of the question which concerned his fellow-disciples, speaks strongly the shame he had on recollecting his former presumption in boasting superior zeal and firmness; and shows that the lesson of humility and self-knowledge he had so lately received, had not been lost.—I incline rather to this second interpretation: but, as the construction will admit either, and as neither of them is unsuitable to the context and the occasion, I thought it the safer method in a translator, to give the expression in the

same extent in which the Evangelist has given it, and leave the choice free to his readers. It may be proper just to mention a third meaning which has been put upon the words, and of which, it must be owned, they are naturally susceptible: *Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these thy fellow disciples?* This, in my judgment, is the least probable of them all. Our Lord was so far from ever showing a jealousy of this kind, lest any of his disciples should rival him in the affection of the rest, that it was often his aim to excite them, in the warmest manner, to mutual love; urging, amongst other motives, that he would consider their love to one another as the surest evidence of their regard and affection to him, and requiring such manifestations of their love to the brethren, as he had given of his love to them, and as show it to be hardly possible that they could exceed this way.

16. *Tend my sheep, ποιμαινε τα προβατα μου.* E. T. *Feed my sheep.* This is the translation given also to the words *Βοσκει τα προβατα μου* in the next verse. But the precepts are not synonymous. The latter is properly, provide them in pasture; the former implies also guide, watch, and defend them. As there is in the original some difference in every one of the three injunctions at this time laid on Peter, there ought to be a corresponding difference in the version. Yet none of our Eng. interpreters seem to have adverted to this. The Vul. must have read differently, as it has *Pasce agnos meos.* But in this reading it has not the support of a single MS. and only the Sax. version.

22, 23. *If I will that he wait my return, εαν αυτον θελω μενειν εως ερχομαι.* Vul. *Sic eum volo manere donec veniam.* This version, which totally alters the sense, has no support from Gr. MSS. or fathers, or from any ancient translation but the Sax. The Cam. verse 22. reads, *Εαν αυτον θελω ούτως μενειν*; but, as it retains *εαν*, the addition of *ούτως* makes no material change in the sense; whereas the Vul. has, in both verses, turned a mere supposition into an affirmation. Some La. MSS. read, agreeably to the Cam. *Si sic eum volo manere*; and some agreeably to the common Gr. *Si eum volo manere.* The Jesuit Maldonat gives up the reading of the Vul. in this place entirely, and even expresses himself with an asperity which will be thought surprising, when it is considered that his argument here hurts not the Protestants, but his own friends and brethren alone. Speaking of the three La. read-

ings given above, he says, "Prima est illa maximè vulgaris, quæ in omnes fere Latinos pervasit codices, eosque incredibili scriptorum negligentia contaminavit, *Sic eum volo manere donec veniam, quid ad te?* nulla prorsus specie probabilitatis," &c. Where is now the merit which this son of Loyola boasted (when, commenting on a passage liable to the like objections) of resigning entirely his own judgment in deference to the authority of the church? Ch. viii. 1—11. N. There indeed, after candidly admitting the weight of the arguments on the opposite side, he replies in this manner: "Sed hæc omnia minus habent ponderis quam una auctoritas ecclesiæ, quæ per concilium Tridentinum, non solum libros omnes, quos nunc habet in usu, sed singulas etiam ejus partes, tanquam canonicas approbavit." Had this good father forgotten that the reading "*Sic eum volo manere,*" which he so disdainfully reprobates, has the sanction of the council of Trent, for it had been the common reading of the Vul. long before, and was in all their approved editions at the time? Had he forgotten that it was first ratified by Pope Sixtus the fifth, after the revisal appointed by him, and then by Pope Clement the eighth, after a second revisal appointed by him? Not one passage in the Vul. can claim the authority of Popes and Councils, if this cannot.

25. *I imagine the world itself would not contain.*—I agree perfectly with those interpreters who think that the hyperbole contained in this verse is much more tolerable, than the torture to which some critics have put the words, in order to make them speak a different sense. For some apposite examples of such hyperboles, both in sacred authors and in profane, I refer the reader to Bishop Pearce. For a refutation of the opinion of Ham. who seems to think that the two last verses were not written by the Evangelist, but by the Asiatic bishops, and of the opinion of Gro. and L. Cl. who think that the whole last chapter is of another hand, I refer him to Wetstein.

INDEX OF TEXTS

IN THE OTHER BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE, AND THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS,
OCCASIONALLY ILLUSTRATED.

In the references to the PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS, D. means Dissertation, P. Part, N. Note. In the references to the NOTES on the Gospels, the chapter and verse of the Gospel, and the number of the Note, when there are more Notes than one on the same verse, are marked in the same manner as in the Notes themselves. The Prefaces to the Gospels, thus: Pr. Mt., Pr. Mr., Pr. L., Pr. J.

GENESIS.

I. 1—5.	-	-	-	D. III. § 4—9.
— 11.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 30.
— 16.	-	-	-	L. ix. 48.
II. 1.	-	-	-	D. III. § 2.
— 4.	-	-	-	Mt. i. 1.
— 23.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 4.
— 24.	-	-	-	Mt. xix. 5.
VI. 9.	-	-	-	L. xvi. 8. 3.
XIII. 4.	-	-	-	J. viii. 25.
XIV. 13.	-	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 15.
XVII. 10, &c.	-	-	-	J. vii. 22.
— 12.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 16. 3.
XXII. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 7. 2.
XXIII. 3, &c.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6.
XXIV. 3.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 63.
— 18.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
— 54. 56. 59.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 13.
XXVI. 19.	-	-	-	J. iv. 10. 2.
XXVII. 30, &c.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 4.
XXVIII. 10, &c.	-	-	-	J. v. 2. 2.
XXXI. 35.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 8.
XXXII. 4, 5.	-	-	-	Ibid.
XXXIII. 5. 8.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6.

INDEX OF TEXTS

XXXV. 18.	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 50.
XXXVII. 35.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 3.
XXXIX. 17.	-	-	Mt. ii. 16.
XLI. 2, 3.	-	-	J. ii. 14. ² .
XLII. 10.	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6.
— 38.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 3.
XLIII. 18. 20.	-	-	J. viii. 25.
XLIV. 18.	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6.
XLV. 3.	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 32.
— 25.	-	-	Mr. iii. 21. ⁴ .
XLVIII. 20.	-	-	J. i. 15. ² .
XLIX. 3, 4.	-	-	L. ii. 23.
L. 2. 5.	-	-	J. xix. 40.

EXODUS.

XII. 6.	-	-	Mr. xv. 42.
— 14.	-	-	Mt. xiv. 23.
— 27.	-	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 4.
— 46.	-	-	Mt. i. 22.
XV. 2.	-	-	J. xi. 25.
— 3.	-	-	Mr. xii. 29.
XVI. 5. 23.	-	-	J. xix. 14.
XVII. 7.	-	-	Mt. iv. 7. ² .
XVIII. 7.	-	-	Mt. ii. 2. ² .
XIX. 10. 14. 22.	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXIV. 17.	-	-	J. v. 37, 38.

LEVITICUS.

X. 1, &c.	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XI. 42, &c.	-	-	— § 11. 16.
— 43, &c.	-	-	L. xiv. 26. ² .
XII. 3.	-	-	Mt. ii. 16. ³ . J. vii. 22.
XIV. 5.	-	-	J. iv. 10. ² .
XX. 25, 26.	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
XXI. 1—6.	-	-	Ibid.
XXII. 32	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXIV. 11. 14.	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 12.
— 15, 16.	-	-	— § 10.

NUMBERS:

III. 32.	-	-	J. xv. 18.
V. 17.	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
— 22.	-	-	Mt. v. 18.
IX. 12.	-	-	Mt. i. 22.
— 15, 16.	-	-	J. v. 37, 38.
XII. 8.	-	-	Ibid.
XV. 37.	-	-	Mt. ix. 20.

XV. 38, 39.	-	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 2.
XIX. 7, 8, 10.	-	-	-	-	L. ii. 22.
XX. 10.	-	-	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 25.
— 12.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
XXII. 29.	-	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 16.
XXIV. 7.	-	-	-	-	J. vii. 38.
XXXII. 19.	-	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 15.
— 24.	-	-	-	-	— 4.
XXXIII. 55.	-	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.

DEUTERONOMY.

IV. 12, 15.	-	-	-	-	J. v. 37, 38.
VI. 4.	-	-	-	-	Mr. xii. 29.
— 8.	-	-	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 5.
VIII. 3.	-	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 4.
X. 16.	-	-	-	-	D. IV. § 22.
XVI. 2.	-	-	-	-	J. xix. 14.
XVIII. 10, 11.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 15.
— 20.	-	-	-	-	J. vii. 52. ² .
XXII. 12.	-	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III, § 2. Mt. ix. 20.
— 19.	-	-	-	-	L. vi. 22. ² .
— 23, 24.	-	-	-	-	Mt. i. 19. ³ .
XXIII. 12, &c.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 10.
XXIV. 1, 2.	-	-	-	-	Mt. i. 19. ³ .
XXV. 1.	-	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 24.
— 5.	-	-	-	-	Mt. xxii. 24.
XXVII. 4.	-	-	-	-	J. iv. 20.
XXX. 11—14.	-	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
XXXII. 4.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
— 17.	-	-	-	-	— P. I. § 15.
— 22.	-	-	-	-	— P. II. § 6.
XXXIII. 8.	-	-	-	-	— P. IV. § 6.

JOSHUA.

II. 9, 24.	-	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 32.
III. 5.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
VII. 13.	-	-	-	-	Ibid.
— 18, 19.	-	-	-	-	J. ix. 24.
XV. 8.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 1.
XX. 7.	-	-	-	-	— P. IV. § 12.
XXI. 32.	-	-	-	-	J. iv. 5.
XXIII. 13.	-	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.
XXIV. 19.	-	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.

JUDGES.

I. 16.	-	-	-	-	Mr. i. 3.
IX. 7.	-	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 30.

XVI. 10.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 16.
XVII. 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 12.

RUTH.

I. 11.	-	-	-	J. xv. 6.
II. 4.	-	-	-	L. i. 28. ² .

I SAMUEL.

I. 23.	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 4.
IV. 7, 8.	-	-	-	L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
— 17.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 1.
VI. 20.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
VII. 9.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 7.
XIV. 45.	-	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22. ³ .
XVIII. 4.	-	-	-	J. xxi. 7.
XXI. 6.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 4.
XXIV. 6.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XXV. 21.	-	-	-	L. xx. 13.
XXVIII. 7. &c.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 15.
————— 23.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

II SAMUEL.

I. 17.	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 17.
— 20.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 1.
XI. 11.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XII. 14.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 11.
XIII. 18.	-	-	-	J. xxi. 7.

I KINGS.

I. 14.	-	-	-	Mt. i. 22.
IV. 33.	-	-	-	J. xix. 29.
XIV. 6.	-	-	-	Mt. x. 2.
XVIII. 7. 9. 13.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6, 7.
————— 31, &c.	-	-	-	————— P. II. § 7.
XIX. 13.	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .
————— 16.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 1.
XX. 4.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
XXI. 10.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 8.

II KINGS.

I. 7, 8.	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .
II. 13.	-	-	-	Ibid.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
IV. 16.	-	-	-	————— § 6.
— 28.	-	-	-	————— § 7.
VI. 21.	-	-	-	Ibid.
VII. 2. 17. 19.	-	-	-	Ibid.

XVIII. 30. 33, &c.	-	-	D. IX P. II. § 10.
XIX. 4. 16. 22. 23.	-	-	§ 12.
XXII. 6,	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
XXIII. 10.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 1.

I CHRONICLES.

V. 1, 2.	-	-	L. ii. 23.
XI. 11.	-	-	J. xv. 18.
— 19.	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22. 3.
XVI. 22.	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 2.
XXIV. 3, &c.	-	-	L. i. 5.

II CHRONICLES.

II. 14, 15.	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
IV. 5.	-	-	J. ii. 6.
XXIV. 12.	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
XXVI. 3.	-	-	Mt. i. 8.
XXIX. 5, &c.	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 10.
XXX. 16, 17, 18.	-	-	§ 11. J. xix. 14.
XXXIII. 6.	-	-	P. II. § 1.
XXXIV. 11.	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
XXXV. 7, 8, 9. 11.	-	-	J. xix. 14.
XXXVI. 22.	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 2.

EZRA.

III. 7.	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
VIII. 25.	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.

NEHEMIAH.

III. 1. 32.	-	-	J. v. 2. 2.
VIII. 8.	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 4.
XII. 39.	-	-	J. v. 2. 2.
— 46.	-	-	J. xv. 18.
XIII. 25.	-	-	Mt. xv. 4.

ESTHER.

IV. 13.	-	-	L. xiv. 26. 2.
V. 10.	-	-	L. ii. 49.
VI. 12.	-	-	Ibid.
VII. 9.	-	-	Ibid.

JOB.

III. 8.	-	-	Mt. iii. 7.
IX. 21. 23.	-	-	L. xii. 25.
XI. 7, 8, 9.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 7.
XXXI. 7.	-	-	J. xx. 17.
XXXVIII. 17.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 9.
XXXIX. 9.	-	-	L. ii. 7.

PSALMS.

I. 6.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
II. 2.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 3, 4.
IV. 1.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I § 19.
XVI. 8.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 20.
— 10.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11.
XX. 1. 7.	-	-	-	J. xvii. 11.
XXXIV. 18.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ .
XXXVII. 11. 29.	-	-	-	— 5. ² .
XXXIX. 3.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
— 5.	-	-	-	L. xii. 25.
XLI. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.
XLIX. 2.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 13.
LXIII. title.	-	-	-	Mr. i. 3.
— 1.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
LXVII. 2.	-	-	-	D. X. P. II. § 4.
LXXXIII. 9.	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. § 4.
LXXXVI. 1.	-	-	-	J. xvii. 11.
LXXXII. 6.	-	-	-	J. x. 35.
LXXXVI. 2.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 15.
XCV. 8.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 22.
XCVI. 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 15.
XCVIII. 3.	-	-	-	L. i. 54, 55. ² .
XCIX. 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CH. 25.	-	-	-	Mt. xxv. 34.
CHII. 1.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
CIV. 4.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 10.
CV. 15.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 2.
CVI. 7.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.
— 16.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 5.
CIX. 16.	-	-	-	L. i. 54, 55. ² .
— 22.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
CXI. 9.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
CXVIII. 26.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 12. Mt. xi. 3.
CXXXI. 2.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 26. ² .
CXXXII. 17.	-	-	-	J. v. 35.
CXXXIX. 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 7.
CXLV. 17.	-	-	-	— P. IV. § 19.

PROVERBS.

V. 4.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 34.
VI. 32.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 28.
VIII. passim.	-	-	-	J. i. 1.
XIV. 4.	-	-	-	L. ii. 7.
XVII. 15.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 17. Mt. xxvii. 24.
— 20.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 22.
XXI. 12.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.

XXIII. 1.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
XXIV. 10.	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 32.
XXIX. 24.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 26. ² .
XXX. 30.	-	-	-	L. i. 28. ³ .

ECCLESIASTES.

V. 2.	-	-	-	L. ii. 14.
VIII. 11.	-	-	-	L. i. 1.

CANTICLES.

I. 8.	-	-	-	L. i. 28. ³ .
III. 10.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
VIII. 6.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 10.

ISAIAH.

I. 3.	-	-	-	L. ii. 7.
— 29.	-	-	-	L. xvi. 21.
II. 20.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 19.
V. 1.	-	-	-	D. X. P. IV. § 6.
— 4.	-	-	-	Mt. xvii. 34.
— 14.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 8.
— 20.	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 54. J. i. 1. ² .
VI. 1, &c.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
VII. 23.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
VIII. 12, 13.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 14.
— 19.	-	-	-	— P. II. § 15. D. I. P. II. § 3.
XI. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 23. ² .
XII. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ² .
XIV. 9.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 8.
— 21.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 36.
XVI. 11.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
XXIX. 4.	-	-	-	D. I. P. II. § 3. D. VI. P. II. § 15.
— 11, 12.	-	-	-	J. vii. 15.
— 19.	-	-	-	L. vi. 35.
XXX. 24.	-	-	-	Mt. iii. 12.
XXXIV. 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 29.
XXXVIII. 10.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 17.
XL. 3.	-	-	-	— P. V. § 4.
— 30, 31.	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 32.
XLI. 7.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
XLII. 1.	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 35.
— 3.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 20.
— 18.	-	-	-	Mr. viii. 24.
XLV. 1.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 2.
XLVIII. 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xxv. 34.
LII. 7.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 3.
LIII. 8.	-	-	-	L. xvi. 8. ³ .

LIII. 9.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. II. § 14.
LV. 1, 2.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
— 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
LVIII. 2.	-	-	-	L. xvi. 21.
LIX. 17.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 2.
LXI. 1, 2.	-	-	-	{ D. V. P. II. § 2. P. IV. § 3. } D. VI. P. V. § 5.
LXIII. 18.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 19.
LXV. 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
LXVI. 24.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 30.

JEREMIAH.

I. 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 13.
IV. 13.	-	-	-	L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
VI. 4.	-	-	-	Ibid. D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IX. 17, 18. 20.	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 17. L. xxii. 36.
XII. 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
XXXIX. 11. 13.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
XLIV. 17.	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 4.
XLIX. 36.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 11.

LAMENTATIONS.

III. 15.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 34.
V. 16.	-	-	-	L. vi. 24, 25, 26.

EZEKIEL.

III. 7.	-	-	-	D. IV. §. 22.
XXXIX. 17--20.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 36.
XLI. 6.	-	-	-	J. xx. 17.

DANIEL.

I. 3. 7, 8, 9. 18.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
II. 18, 19. 27, 28, 29, 30. 47.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 4.
— 44.	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. § 1.
IV. 9.	-	-	-	§ 4.
— 26.	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. § 4.
VII. 13, 14.	-	-	-	§ 1. & P. IV. § 13.
VIII. 1.	-	-	-	J. viii. 25.
IX. 25, 26.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 3.
X. 16.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.

HOSEA.

I. 1, 2.	-	-	-	Mr. i. 1.
XI. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. i. 22.

AMOS.

II. 6.	-	-	-	Mt. x. 10. 3.
VI. 4.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

VIII. 6.	-	-	-	Mt. x. 10. ³ .
IX. 2, 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 7.

JONAH.

I. 6.	-	-	-	D. VII. § 4.
III. 2.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 23.

MICAH.

III. 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 12.
IV. 6, 7.	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. § 1.
V. 2.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 6. ² .
VI. 5. 8.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.

HABAKKUK.

III. 2.	-	-	-	L. i. 54, 55. ² .
---------	---	---	---	------------------------------

ZECHARIAH.

I. 20.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
XI. 12, 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 9, 10.
XIII. 4.	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .

MALACHI.

III. 1.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 15.
---------	---	---	---	------------------------

ACTS.

I. 4. 8.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 14.
— 6.	-	-	-	Mt. xvii. 11.
— 13.	-	-	-	Mt. i. 6.
— 16.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 18.
II. 23.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21. Mt. xxvi. 45. ² .
— 25.	-	-	-	§ 20.
— 27. 31.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 3. 11, 12.
— 38.	-	-	-	— P. III. § 7.
III. 16.	-	-	-	Mr. xi. 22.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 21.	-	-	-	Mt. xvii. 11.
IV. 1.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 52.
— 4.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 6.	-	-	-	L. iii. 2.
— 26, 27.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 4.
— 32.	-	-	-	J. v. 18.
— 33.	-	-	-	L. ii. 40.
V. 24. 26.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 52.
— 33.	-	-	-	J. xii. 10.
— 34.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 6.
— 39.	-	-	-	Mt. xxv. 9.
VI. 1, &c.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 6.

VI. 4.	-	-	-	L. 1. 2.
— 11.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 8.
— 13.	-	-	-	————— § 14.
VII. 10. 20.	-	-	-	L. ii. 40.
— 53.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 59.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
VIII. 4.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 22.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 23. D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 35.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 14.
— 39.	-	-	-	Mt. iii. 11.
IX. 29.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 31.	-	-	-	J. xiv. 16.
— 37.	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.
X. 22.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 12.
— 38.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 9.
— 44.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 45.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
XI. 18.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 19.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 20.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 6.
— 26.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 10. Mt. ii. 12.
XII. 5.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
XIII. 2.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
— 10.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3.
— 22.	-	-	-	L. iv. 22.
— 25.	-	-	-	L. xii. 25.
— 34.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
— 42.	-	-	-	————— P. V. § 12.
— 43.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 45.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 12.
— 50.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 1.
XIV. 15.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
— 23.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 7.
— 25.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
XV. 37.	-	-	-	J. xii. 10.
XVI. 1.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
— 6.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 13. 16.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
— 30.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
— 33.	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.
XVII. 3.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 6.
— 4.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 1.
— 11.	-	-	-	L. i. 2.
— 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 1.
— 19. 22.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
— 18.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 12, 13. 17.
— 22.	-	-	-	————— § 22.

XVII. 30.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
XVIII. 5. 23.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 6.
—— 6.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 12.
—— 12.	-	-	-	L. ii. 2. ² .
—— 23.	-	-	-	L. i. 3. ² .
—— 26.	-	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22.
XIX. 16.	-	-	-	J. xxi. 7. ² .
XX. 7. 9.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 12.
—— 18.	-	-	-	Mt. xxviii. 9.
—— 21.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 24.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 16. L. xii. 25.
—— 32.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
XXI. 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 16.
—— 29.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 20.
XXII. 5.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 6 ⁶ .
XXIII. 1.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 13.
—— 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23. Mt. xxii. 23.
XXIV. 5. 14, 15.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 2, 3, 4.
XXV. 2.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 1.
—— 11. 25.	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 15.
—— 19.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 22.
XXVI. 5.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21. D. IX. P. IV. § 1.
—— 11.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 13.
—— 18.	-	-	-	D. X. P. IV. § 15.
—— 20.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
—— 24.	-	-	-	J. vii. 15.
—— 31.	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 15.
XXVII. 20.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 45.
—— 40.	-	-	-	L. iv. 42. ² .
XXVIII. 7.	-	-	-	J. xv. 18.
—— 17.	-	-	-	L. xiv. 1. J. i. 15. ³ .
—— 31.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 7.

ROMANS.

I. 4.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 7.
— 9.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 19. D. XI. P. I. § 12.
II. 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
— 21.	-	-	-	—— P. V. § 10.
III. 11.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.
—— 21, 22.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.
—— 22. 26.	-	-	-	Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 21.	-	-	-	L. i. 1.
VI. 17.	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ² .
VII. 3.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 12.
—— 12.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 7.
X. 1.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
— 2.	-	-	-	L. iv. 22.
— 3.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 23.

X. 6, 7.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 14. L. xvii. 21.
— 10.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 23.
— 15.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 3, 4, 5.
— 16, 17.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15.
XI. 2.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
— 14.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 22.	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
— 29.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
XII. 3. 6.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 13, 14.
XIV. 5.	-	-	-	L. i. 1. D. IX. P. III. § 5.
— 17.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
— 22, 23.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 14. D. IX. P. III. § 5.
XV. 30.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
XVI. 17.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 11.
— 25, 26.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 20. D. IX. P. I. § 3.

I CORINTHIANS.

I. 10.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
— 17.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 10.
— 21.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 10.
— 30.	-	-	-	J. xi. 25.
II. 4, 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 10. D. I. P. I. § 10.
— 7—10.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 3.
— 14.	-	-	-	J. iii. 3. 2.
III. 2.	-	-	-	L. i. 64.
— 3.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
— 11.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 11.
IV. 1.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 6.
— 6.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
V. 2.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
VI. 3.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 23.
— 12.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 25.
VII. 2.	-	-	-	J. v. 18.
— 12, 13, 14.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
— 14.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 11.
— 39.	-	-	-	J. iii. 21.
VIII. 3.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
— 4.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 15.
— 13.	-	-	-	J. viii. 51.
IX. 18.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 19.
X. 9.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 6.
— 16.	-	-	-	Mt. xiv. 19.
— 17.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 26.
— 20, 21.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 14—18.
XI. 10.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 8.
XII. 12.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 12.

XIV. 2. 12.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
— 11.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 14.
— 32.	-	-	-	— P. II. § 3.
XV. 54.	-	-	-	L. ii. 2. 3.
— 55.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 18. 23.
XVI. 11.	-	-	-	L. xi. 7.

II CORINTHIANS.

I. 17.	-	-	-	J. xii. 10.
— 20.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 37.
III. 14.	-	-	-	D. V. P. III. § 3.
IV. 2.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 16.	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 32.
— 17.	-	-	-	D. X. P. II. § 4.
V. 6, &c.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
— 13.	-	-	-	Mr. iii. 21. 4.
VI. 1.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 2.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 51.
VII. 1.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 11. N. 3.
— 3.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
— 4.	-	-	-	Mt. x. 30.
— 8. 10.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
VIII. 18.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 19.
XII. 1, &c.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 21. 23.
— 7.	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.
— 18.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 23.
XIII. 8.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.

GALATIANS.

I. 1.	-	-	-	Mt. x. 2.
— 23.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 14.
II. 2. 7.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 20.
— 3.	-	-	-	Mt. i. 19.
— 15.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 45. 2.
— 16. 20.	-	-	-	Mr. xi. 22.
— 21.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
III. 1.	-	-	-	ibid.
— 3.	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 11. N.
— 9.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 12.
— 22.	-	-	-	Mr. xi. 22.
IV. 4.	-	-	-	L. i. 35.
— 9.	-	-	-	J. iii. 3.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 12.
— 22, &c.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 7.
V. 4. 7.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 12.	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.

V. 19, 20, 21. - - D. I. P. I. § 11. N. D. IX. P. IV. § 11.
 VI. 9. - - - - - Mt. xv. 32.

EPHESIANS.

I. 9. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3, 11.
 — 13. - - - D. V. P. II. § 16.
 II. 12. - - - D. VI. P. I. § 16.
 — 20. - - - D. VII. P. II. § 11.
 III. 3, 5, 6, 9. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
 — 7. - - - J. iv. 10.
 — 13. - - - Mt. xv. 32.
 — 18. - - - L. xi. 7.
 IV. 7. - - - J. iv. 10.
 — 11. - - - D. VI. P. V. § 16.
 — 18. - - - D. IV. § 23. N.
 — 20. - - - D. V. P. IV. § 12.
 — 21. - - - J. i. 17.
 — 29. - - - L. ii. 40.
 V. 32. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 7. D. X. P. III. § 9.
 VI. 19. - - - ———— § 3.

PHILIPPIANS.

I. 21, &c. - - - D. VI. P. II. § 23.
 II. 10. - - - ———— § 6.
 III. 9. - - - Mr. xi. 22.
 IV. 6. - - - Mt. vi. 25.
 — 15. - - - D. V. P. II. § 19.

COLOSSIANS.

I. 20. - - - Mt. v. 9.
 — 26, 27. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 3.
 II 22. - - - Mt. xv. 9.
 III. 8. - - - D. IX. P. II. § 13.
 IV. 6. - - - L. ii. 40.

I THESSALONIANS.

I. 3. - - - Mr. xi. 22.

II THESSALONIANS.

I. 12. - - - J. i. 17.
 II. 7. - - - D. IX. P. I. § 4.
 — 11. - - - Mt. vi. 13.
 — 12. - - - Mr. xvi. 16. ³. J. i. 17.
 — 15. - - - Pr. Mt. § 8.
 III. 8. - - - Mt. vi. 25.

I TIMOTHY.

I. 13.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 13. D. X. P. V. § 11.
— 15.	-	-	-	J. xv. 18.
II. 4.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8.
— 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 4.
III. 11.	-	-	-	———— P. I. § 2.
— 15.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 16.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 11. 13.
IV. 1.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 20.
— 3.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 3. 10. 12.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
— 5.	-	-	-	Mr. vii. 2.
— 6.	-	-	-	L. i. 3.
— 10.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8.
— 12.	-	-	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
V. 8.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 25.
— 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
— 16.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.
VI. 1.	-	-	-	J. i. 16.
— 2.	-	-	-	J. xx. 27.

II TIMOTHY.

II. 7.	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 15. ³ .
— 15.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
III. 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 2.
— 4.	-	-	-	L. i. 3. ³ .
— 6.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
— 8.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 10.	-	-	-	L. i. 3.
— 15.	-	-	-	J. vii. 15.
IV. 2.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 10. L. i. 2.
— 4.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 5.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 16. L. i. 1.
— 7.	-	-	-	L. xii. 25.
— 8.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 45.
— 17.	-	-	-	L. i. 1.

TITUS.

I. 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 7. 17.
— 12.	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
— 14.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
II. 3.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 2.
— 11.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8. N. J. i. 17.
III. 10, 11.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 11, 12.

HEBREWS.

I. 2.	-	-	-	J. i. 3.
-- 3.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 9.
-- 4, &c.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11.
-- 7.	-	-	-	L. xix. 9.
III. 1.	-	-	-	J. x. 36.
IV. 2.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 6.
— 9.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 5. ² .
V. 7.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
VI. 4.	-	-	-	J. iv. 10.
VII. 21.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
— 26.	-	-	-	— P. IV. § 7.
IX. 9.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 3.
— 10.	-	-	-	D. II. P. II. § 7. Mr. vii. 4.
— 16, 17.	-	-	-	D. V. P. III. § 1.
X. 13.	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 25.
— 23.	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.
— 26.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 36.	-	-	-	L. viii. 15.
— 37.	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 3.
— 38.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 10.
XI. 11.	-	-	-	L. xii. 25.
— 13.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 14.
— 19.	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 3.
— 37.	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .
XII. 3.	-	-	-	L. viii. 15.
— 17.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 4.
— 25.	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 12.
XIII. 19.	-	-	-	Mt. xvii. 11.
— 24.	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 1.

JAMES.

I. 2.	-	-	-	Mr. x. 30.
-- 8.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 19.
-- 13.	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 7. ² .
-- 20.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.
II. 7.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 13.
— 19.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 21.
-- 25.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 14.
III. 1.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 12.
— 6.	-	-	-	L. xii. 25. D. VI. P. II. § 1.
— 15.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 21.
V. 12.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 37.
— 16.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
— 17.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
— 19.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.

I PETER.

I. 2. 20.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
— 22.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
II. 6, 7.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15.
— 24.	-	-	-	Mt. viii. 17.
III. 5, 6.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 6.
— 16.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 44. ² . D. XI. P. II. § 6.
— 20, 21.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 8.
IV. 16.	-	-	-	————— § 10.
— 24.	-	-	-	Mt. viii. 17.
V. 4.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
— 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3.
— 12.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.

II PETER.

II. 1.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 10.
— 2.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
— 4.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 19.
— 14.	-	-	-	Mr. vii. 22.
— 22.	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.

I JOHN.

I. 8.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 12.
II. 1.	-	-	-	J. xiv. 16.
— 21.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
III. 7.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 31.
— 9.	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 12.

II JOHN.

2.	-	-	-	J. i. 17.
----	---	---	---	-----------

III JOHN.

4.	-	-	-	J. xvi. 2.
8.	-	-	-	J. i. 7.
9.	-	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 11.

JUDE.

9, 10.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II. § 1.
--------	---	---	---	--------------------

REVELATION.

I. 5.	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.
— 10.	-	-	-	J. v. 2. ² .

I. 12.	-	-	-	J. i. 23.
— 13.	-	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 13.
— 16.	-	-	-	J. vii. 24.
— 20.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 7. D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
II. 1. 8. 12. 18.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
— 5. 16. 21, 22.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
— 7.	-	-	-	— P. II. § 21.
— 7. 11. 17. 29.	-	-	-	D. II. P. III § 5.
III. 1. 7. 14.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 16.
— 4.	-	-	-	J. xvii. 11.
— 19	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 7.
IV. 3, &c.	-	-	-	— P. IV. § 14.
V. 1.	-	-	-	D. II. P. I. § 3.
— 2.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 8.
— 8.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
— 13.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 6.
VI. 6.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5.
— 8.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 13.
— 14.	-	-	-	D. II. P. I. § 3.
VIII. 3.	-	-	-	L. vi. 12.
— 7.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 30.
IX. 20.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 19.
X. 7.	-	-	-	— P. V. § 14.
XII. 12.	-	-	-	J. i. 14. ² .
XIII. 6.	-	-	-	Ibid.
XIV. 6, 7.	-	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 17.
XV. 4.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 19.
XVI. 11.	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II § 11.
XVII. 7.	-	-	-	— P. I § 7. 11. D. X. P. III. § 9.
XIX. 17, 18.	-	-	-	L. xxii. 36.
XX. 2.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3.
— 14.	-	-	-	— P. II. § 13.
XXI. 3.	-	-	-	L. xvi. 9. ³ . J. i. 14. ² .

TOBIT.

II. 1.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
--------	---	---	---	-----------------------

JUDITH.

IX. 11.	-	-	-	L. vi. 35.
XII. 15.	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

WISDOM.

VII. 3.	-	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
VIII. 19, 20.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II § 19.
XI. 14.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
XVI. 13.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 17.
— 25.	-	-	-	J. iv. 10.

ECCLESIASTICUS.

XIX. 26.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
XXIV. 31.	-	-	-	Mr. vi. 40.
XXV. 26.	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
XXVI. 7.	-	-	-	Mt. v. 28.
XXXII. 18.	-	-	-	L. xviii. 7.

I MACCABEES.

II. 21.	-	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22. ³ .
— 29.	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.
IV. 48.	-	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
— 59.	-	-	-	J. x. 22.

II MACCABEES.

II. 29.	-	-	-	Mt. xxv. 34.
VII. 41.	-	-	-	J. xv. 18.

INDEX

OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES OCCASIONALLY ILLUSTRATED.

A

<i>Αβυσσος</i> - - -		D. VI. P. II: § 14. L. viii. 31.
<i>Αγαθος</i> - - -		Mt. xxv. 26.
<i>Αγαλλιαω</i> - - -		J. viii. 56.
<i>Αγαπη μου</i> - - -		J. xv. 10.
<i>Αγγελος</i> - - -		D. VIII. P. III. § 8—16.
<i>Αγιος</i> - - -		D. VI. P. IV.
— του Θεου - - -		D. V. P. IV. § 14. L. iv. 34.
<i>Αγιον πνευμα</i> - - -		Mt. iii. 11. ² .
<i>Αγιος κληθησεται</i> - - -		L. ii. 23. ² .
<i>Αγιαφος</i> - - -		Mt. ix. 16.
<i>Αδης</i> - - -		D. VI. P. II.
<i>Αδικια</i> - - -		J. vii. 18.
<i>Αδικος</i> - - -		Mt. xxv. 26.
<i>Αξυμα</i> - - -		D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
<i>Αθειτω</i> - - -		Mr. vii. 9.
<i>Αιρεσις</i> - - -		D. IX. P. IV.
<i>Αιρω</i> - - -		J. x. 18. xv. 2.
<i>Αιτω</i> - - -		J. xvi. 30.
<i>Αιχμαλωσια</i> - - -		Mt. i. 11, 12.
<i>Αιων</i> - - -		Mt. xii. 32.
<i>εις τον Αιωνα</i> - - -		J. viii. 51.
<i>εκ του Αιωνος</i> - - -		J. ix. 32.
<i>Αιωνιος</i> - - -		L. xvi. 9. ³ .
<i>Ακακος</i> - - -		D. VI. P. IV. § 17!
<i>Ακανθα, Ακανθος</i> - - -		Mt. xxvii. 29.
<i>Ακοη</i> - - -		D. XII. P. I. § 15.
<i>Ακουω</i> - - -		J. viii. 43. Mr. iv. 24.
<i>Ακριβοω</i> - - -		Mt. ii. 7.
<i>Ακρις</i> - - -		Mt. iii. 4. ² .
<i>Αλειτης ονος</i> - - -		Mt. xviii. 6.
<i>η Αληθεια</i> - - -		J. i. 17.

<i>Ἀληθής</i>	-	-	J. v. 31.
<i>Ἀληθινός</i>	.	-	J. vii. 28. ² .
<i>Ἄλλα</i>	-	-	Mt. xx. 23.
<i>Ἀλλογενής</i>	-	-	L. xvii. 18.
<i>Ἀμαρτία</i>	-	-	J. viii. 46. ² .
<i>Ἀμαρτωλός</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 45. ² . D. XII. P. V. § 12.
<i>Ἀμεταμελητός</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. III. § 9.
<i>Ἀμετανόητος</i>	-	-	Ibid.
<i>Ἀμην</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 18.
<i>Ἀμιαντός</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 17.
<i>Ἀμμιβλήστρον</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 18.
<i>Ἀναβαίνω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Ἀναβλέπω</i>	-	-	Mr. viii. 24.
<i>Ἀναγκαζώ</i>	-	-	L. xxiv. 29.
<i>Ἀναθεμα</i>	-	-	Mt. xv. 4.
<i>Ἀνακειμαι</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 5.
<i>Ἀνακλινώ</i>	-	-	Ibid.
<i>Ἀναλαμβάνω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Ἀναληψίς</i>	-	-	L. ix. 51.
<i>Ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 14.
<i>Ἀναπιπιώ</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
<i>Ἀναπληροῶ</i>	-	-	Mt. xiii. 14.
<i>Ἀναστασις</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 19. Mt. xxii. 23.
<i>Ἀναστροφή</i>	-	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
<i>Ἀνατολή</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 2. L. i. 78.
<i>Ἀναφέρω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 18.
<i>Ἄνηθον</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 23.
<i>Ἄνθιστημι</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 25.
<i>Ἄνθυπατος</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
<i>Ἀνθρωποκτόνος</i>	-	-	J. viii. 44.
<i>Ἄνθρωπος</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 18.
<i>Ἄνοητος</i>	-	-	L. xxiv. 25.
<i>Ἄνομος</i>	-	-	Mt. xxv. 26.
<i>Ἀνταλλαγμά</i>	-	-	Mr. viii. 37. ² .
<i>Ἀντεῖπειν</i>	-	-	L. xxi. 15.
<i>Ἄντι</i>	-	-	J. i. 16.
<i>Ἀντιδικός</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3, 4. 8.
<i>Ἀντιλεγείν</i>	-	-	L. xxi. 15.
<i>Ἀντιπαροερχομαι</i>	-	-	L. x. 32.
<i>Ἀντήλημα</i>	-	-	J. iv. 11.
<i>Ἄνωθεν</i>	-	-	J. iii. 3.
<i>Ἀπαγχώ</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 5.
<i>Ἀπαλλασσω</i>	-	-	L. xii. 58.
<i>Ἀπειθῶν</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15.
<i>Ἀπελιζώ</i>	-	-	L. vi. 95.
<i>Ἀπεχῶ</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 2.

<i>Απεχει</i>	-	-	Mr. xiv. 41.
<i>Απιστία</i>	-	-	Mr. ix. 24.
<i>Απιστος</i>	-	-	L. xii. 46. J. xx. 27.
<i>Απλους</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 22.
<i>Απο</i>	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 15. Mt. xv. i. L. x. 30.
<i>Απογραφεσθαι</i>	-	-	L. ii. 1. ² .
<i>Αποδημew</i>	-	-	Mt. xxi. 33.
<i>Αποικια, Αποικεσια</i>	-	-	Mt. i. 11, 12.
<i>Αποκαθιστημι</i>	-	-	Mt. xvii. 11.
<i>Αποκαλυψις</i>	-	-	D. IX. P. I. § 3.
<i>Αποκοπτω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
<i>Αποκρουπω</i>	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ² .
<i>Απολυω</i>	-	-	Mt. i. 19. ³ . L. vi. 37.
<i>Απομνημονευματα</i>	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 26.
<i>Αποστερευω</i>	-	-	Mr. x. 19.
<i>Αποστελλω</i>	-	-	J. x. 36.
<i>Αποστολος</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 8. Mt. x. 2. J. x. 36.
<i>Αποσυναγωγος</i>	-	-	J. ix. 22.
<i>Αποτεμνω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
<i>Αποτιμασθαι</i>	-	-	L. ii. 1. ² .
<i>Αποφερω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Απιεσθαι</i>	-	-	J. xx. 17.
<i>Αργος</i>	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
<i>Αργυριον</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 4, 5. 10.
<i>Αρειος παγος</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
<i>Αριστεω</i>	-	-	J. xxi. 12.
<i>Αρνιον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Αρπαζω</i>	-	-	D. V. P. II. § 21.
<i>Αρτι</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 18.
<i>Αρτος</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 3. ² . xxvi. 26. L. xiv. 15.
<i>Αρτοι της προθεσεως</i>	-	-	Mt. xii. 4. ² .
<i>Αρχη</i>	-	-	Mr. i. 1 D. III. § 9.
<i>την Αρχην</i>	-	-	J. viii. 25.
<i>Αρχιερευς</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 4.
<i>Αρχιτελωνης</i>	-	-	L. xix. 2.
<i>Αρχιτροκλιнос</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
<i>Αρχομαι</i>	-	-	Mr. v. 17.
<i>Αρχομενος</i>	-	-	L. iii. 23.
<i>Αρχοντες</i>	-	-	L. xiv. 1.
<i>οι Αρχοντες αυτου</i>	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
<i>Αρχων του κοσμου τριτε, και ε.</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
<i>Ασκος</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 17.
<i>Ασδαριον</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
<i>Αστραπη</i>	-	-	L. xi. 36.
<i>Αυλη</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 3. ² .
<i>Αυταρχεια</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 18.
<i>Αυτοκατακριτος</i>	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 12.

<i>Αφανίζω</i>	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 10.
<i>Αφεδρων</i>	-	-	-	Mr. vii. 19.
<i>Αφιεναι το πνευμα</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 50.
<i>Αφοριζω</i>	-	-	-	L. vi. 22.
<i>Αχρειος</i>	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 14.

B

<i>Βαπτίζω</i>	}	-	-	{ D. VIII. P. II. § 2. Mt. iii. 11.
<i>Βαπτεω</i>				
<i>Βαπτισμα</i>	}	-	-	{ Mt. xx. 22. xxi. 25. Mr. vii.
<i>Βαπτισμος</i>				
<i>Βαπτιστης</i>	-	-	-	Mt. iii. 1. ² .
<i>Βαρος</i>	-	-	-	D. X. P. II. § 4.
<i>Βασανιζω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. viii. 6.
<i>Βασανιστης</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xviii. 34.
<i>Βασιλεια</i>	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. L. xix. 12.
<i>Βασιλευς</i>	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 22.
<i>Βασιλικος</i>	-	-	-	J. iv. 46.
<i>Βαττολογεω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 7.
<i>Βδελυγμα της ερημωσεως</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 15. ² .
<i>Βεελζεβουλ</i>	-	-	-	Mt. ix. 25.
<i>Βιβλιον. κ. ε.</i>	-	-	-	D. II. P. I. § 3. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Βιβλος γενεσεως</i>	-	-	-	Mt. i. 1. D. XI. P. I. § 18, 19, 20.
<i>Βλασφημια</i>	-	-	-	D. IX. P. II.
<i>Βοηθεω</i>	-	-	-	Mr. ix. 24.
<i>Βολις</i>	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.
<i>Βουλευτης</i>	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 50.
<i>Βουλευω</i>	-	-	-	J. xii. 10.
<i>Βους</i>	-	-	-	J. ii. 14.
<i>Βρωσις</i>	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 19.
<i>Βυθιζομαι</i>	-	-	-	L. v. 7.

Γ

<i>Γαζοφυλακιον</i>	-	-	-	Mr. xii. 41.
<i>Γαμεω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 38.
<i>Γαρ</i>	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 11.
<i>Γαστερες αγροι</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
<i>Γεννα</i>	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II.
<i>Γειτων</i>	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
<i>Γενεα</i>	-	-	-	L. xvi. 8. ³ .
<i>Γενεαλογια</i>	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 18.
<i>Γενεσια</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xiv. 6.
<i>Γεννημα της αμπελου</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 29.
<i>Γενομενος</i>	-	-	-	J. xiii. 2.
<i>Γενος</i>	-	-	-	Mr. ix. 29.
<i>Γη</i>	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 6. v. 5. ² . x. 5. ² . xxvii. 45.

<i>Γηγενής</i>	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 13
<i>Γινεσθαι</i>	-	-	L. ii. 2. ³ .
<i>Γινωσκω</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
<i>Γλωσσα</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. IV. § 9
<i>Γογγυσμος</i>	-	-	J. vii. 12.
<i>Γραμματα</i>	-	-	———— 15.
<i>Γραμματεὺς</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 4. ² . D. XII. P. V. § 12.
<i>Γραφή</i>	-	-	J. vii. 15.
<i>Γραφω</i>	-	-	Mr. xii. 19. *
<i>Γυμνος</i>	-	-	J. xxi. 7. ² .
<i>Γυναικαριον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Γυνή</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 28. J. ii. 4.

Δ

<i>Δαιμονιον</i>	-	-	D. VI P. I. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Δαιμονιζομενος</i>	-	-	———— § 9, 10.
<i>Δαιμονιωδής</i>	-	-	———— § 21.
<i>Δεήσεις</i>	-	-	L. vi. 12.
<i>Δειπνον</i>	-	-	J. xxi. 12.
<i>Δεισιδαιμων</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 22.
<i>Δενδρον</i>	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
<i>Δεσποτης</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.
<i>Δευτερουπρωτος</i>	-	-	L. vi. 1.
<i>Δεω</i>	-	-	Mt. xviii. 18.
<i>Δηναριον</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 4. 6. 10.
<i>Δια μεσου</i>	-	-	L. xvii. 11.
<i>Διαβαινω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Διαβολος</i>	-	-	———— P. I.
<i>Διαθηκη</i>	-	-	D. V. P. III.
<i>Διακομιδή</i>	-	-	Mt. i 11, 12.
<i>Δικονος</i>	-	-	Mt. xx. 26, 27.
<i>Διαλεγομαι</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12.
<i>Διανοιγον μητραν</i>	-	-	L. ii. 23.
<i>Διαπεραω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
<i>Διασπορα</i>	-	-	J. vii. 35
<i>Διδασκαλῖαι δαιμονιων</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 20.
<i>Διδασκαλος</i>	-	-	D. VII. P. II. Mt. xxiii. 8.
<i>Διδασκω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. V. Mt. xxviii. 19. 20.
<i>Διδαχη</i>	-	-	Mt. vii 28.
<i>Διδραγμα</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 7.
<i>Διδωμι σημειον</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 24.
<i>Διειτης</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 16. ² .
<i>Δικαιος</i>	-	-	{ Mt. i. 19. xxvii. 24, D. VI. P. } IV. § 17.
<i>Δικαιοσυνη</i>	-	-	Mt. iii. 15. vi. 1. xxi. 32.
<i>Δικαιοσυνη του Θεου</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 33.
<i>Δικαιωω</i>	-	-	L. vii. 29. ² . 35.

<i>Δικτυον</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 18.
<i>Διχοτομεω, διχαζω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
<i>Διψαω</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
<i>Διψυχος</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 19.
<i>Διωκω</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 11. 23.
<i>Δοκew</i>	-	-	Mr. x. 42.
<i>Δοκος</i>	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.
<i>Δοξα</i>	-	-	D. X. P. II. § 4.
<i>Δος δοξαν τω Θεω</i>	-	-	J. ix. 24.
<i>Δουλος</i>	-	-	D. VII. P. I. Mt. xx. 26, 27.
<i>ὁ Δρακων ὁ μεγας</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
<i>Δρομος</i>	-	-	L. xii. 25.
<i>Δυναμαι</i>	-	-	Mr. ii. 19. ² .
<i>ου Δυναται ιδειν</i>	-	-	J. iii. 3. ² .
<i>ἡ Δυναμις</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 64.
<i>Δωρεα</i>	-	-	J. iv. 10.
<i>Δωρον</i>	-	-	Mr. vii. 11, 12.

E

<i>Ἐβραϊστι</i>	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 14—20.
<i>Ἐγγαστριμυθος</i>	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 3.
<i>Ἐγγιζειν</i>	-	-	L. xviii. 35.
<i>Ἐγκαινια</i>	-	-	J. x. 22.
<i>Ἐθναρχης</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 22.
<i>Ἐθνος</i>	-	-	Mt. xxi. 43. ² .
<i>Ει</i>	-	-	Mr. viii. 12. xv. 44. L. xii. 49.
<i>Ειδος</i>	-	-	J. v. 37, 38.
<i>Ειδω</i>	-	-	L. x. 32.
<i>Ειρηνη</i>	-	-	Mt. x. 12.
<i>Ειρηνοποιος</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 9.
<i>Εις</i>	-	-	L. vii. 30.
<i>Ἐις</i>	-	-	Mr. xii. 29.
<i>Εισαφερω</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 13.
<i>Εκ</i>	-	-	J. iii. 25.
<i>Ἐκατονταρχος</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
<i>Ἐκβαλλειν ονομα πονηρον</i>	-	-	L. vi. 22. ² .
<i>Ἐκγαμιζω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 38.
<i>Ἐκδημεω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
<i>Ἐκδικew</i>	-	-	L. xviii. 3.
<i>Ἐκεινος</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 31. L. ix. 34.
<i>Ἐκκακειν</i>	-	-	L. xviii. 1. ² .
<i>Ἐκκλησια</i>	-	-	Mt. xviii. 17.
<i>Ἐκκοπτω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
<i>Ἐκλειπω</i>	-	-	L. xvi. 9. ² .
<i>Ἐκλεκτος</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15. Mt. xxii. 14.
<i>ὁ Ἐκλεκτος του Θεου</i>	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 14.
<i>Ἐκλυω</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 36. ² . xv. 32.
<i>Ἐκπειραζω</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 7. ² .

<i>Εκπορευομενον εκ τῶ στοματος</i>			Mt. iv. 4.
<i>Ελεγχω</i>	-	-	J. viii. 46.
<i>Ελεεω</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 36.
<i>Ελεημων</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
<i>Ελεος</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 13. ² .
<i>Ελληνις</i>	-	-	Mr. vii. 29.
<i>Ελληνισται</i>	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 6.
<i>Εμβλεπω</i>	-	-	Mr. viii. 24.
<i>Εμβριμασμαι</i>	-	-	Mr. ix. 25.
<i>Εμπαιζω</i>	-	-	Mt. ii. 16.
<i>Εμπροσθεν</i>	-	-	J. i. 15. ² .
<i>Εν</i>	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 7, 8. L. i. 17. xvii. 21.
<i>Εν Θεω</i>	-	-	J. iii. 21.
<i>Εν τῷ ονοματι Θεου</i>	-	-	J. xvii. 11.
<i>Εν ὕδατι</i>	-	-	Mt. iii. 11.
<i>Εναρετος</i>	-	-	Mt. i. 19. xxv. 26.
<i>Ενδημεω</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
<i>Ενδυμα</i>	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .
<i>Ενοντα</i>	-	-	L. xi. 41.
<i>Ενοχος</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 21, 22.
<i>Ενταλμα</i>	-	-	Mt. xv. 9.
<i>Ενταφιαζω</i>	-	-	J. xix. 40.
<i>Εντολη</i>	-	-	Mt. xv. 9.
<i>Εντος</i>	-	-	L. xvii. 21.
<i>Ενωπιον Θεου</i>	-	-	L. i. 75.
<i>Εξαιτεομαι</i>	-	-	L. xxii. 31.
<i>Εξελθειν</i>	-	-	Mr. ix. 29.
<i>Εξιστημι</i>	-	-	Mr. iii. 21. ⁴ .
<i>Εξοδος</i>	-	-	Pr. Mr. § 2. L. ix. 31.
<i>Εξομολογουμαι</i>	-	-	Mt. xi. 25.
<i>Εξορκιζω</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7.
<i>Εξουσιαζω</i>	-	-	L. xxii. 25.
<i>Εορτη</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 5.
<i>Επαγγελια</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 14.
<i>Επανω</i>	-	-	L. iv. 39.
<i>Επενδυτης</i>	-	-	J. xxi. 7.
<i>Επηρεαζω</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 44.
<i>Επι το αυτο</i>	-	-	Mt. xxii. 34.
<i>Επι τῷ ονοματι</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 5.
<i>Επιβαλλω</i>	-	-	Mr. xiv. 72.
<i>Επιβουλος</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 6.
<i>Επιγειος</i>	-	-	———— P. II. § 6, 7.
<i>Επιγρους τῷ πνευματι αυτου</i>	-	-	Mr. ii. 8.
<i>Επιζητεω</i>	-	-	L. iv. 42.
<i>Επιθυμεω</i>	-	-	L. xvi. 21.
<i>Επικαταρατος</i>	-	-	Mt. xv. 4.
<i>Επιουσιος</i>	-	-	Mt. vi. 11.
<i>Επισκεπτομαι</i>	-	-	Mt. xxv. 36. L. vii. 16.

<i>Επιστροφω</i>	-	-	L. xxii. 32.
<i>Επιτιμαω</i>	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22. ² . Mr. ix. 25.
<i>Επιτροπος</i>	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 4.
<i>Επιφωσκω</i>	-	-	L. xxiii. 54.
<i>Επουρανιος</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 6, 7.
<i>Επω</i>	-	-	J. xii. 49.
<i>Επω παν πονηρον ρημα</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 11.
<i>Εργαζομαι</i>	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 12.
<i>Ερημος</i>	-	-	Mr. i. 3. D. XII. P. V. § 12.
<i>Εριφιον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Ερδιμμενοι</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 36. ² .
<i>ο Ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυριου</i>			{ D. V. P. XII. § 12. P. IV. § 13. Mt. xi. 3.
<i>Ερωταω</i>	-	-	J. xvi. 30.
<i>Εσκυλμενοι</i>	-	-	Mt. ix. 36. ² .
<i>Εστως</i>	-	-	L. v. ² .
<i>Εταιρος</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
<i>Ευαγγελιον</i>	-	-	D. V. P. II.
<i>Ευαγγελιζειν</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 14.
<i>Ευαγγελιστης</i>	-	-	§ 16.
<i>Ευδοκια</i>	-	-	L. ii. 14. ² .
<i>Ευλαβης</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
<i>ο Ευλογητος</i>	-	-	Mr. xiv. 61.
<i>Ευλογεω</i>	-	-	Mt. xiv. 19.
<i>Ευλογητος</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 3.
<i>Ευχαριστιεω</i>	-	-	Mt. xiv. 19.
<i>Εφημερια</i>	-	-	L. i. 5.
<i>Εως θανατου</i>	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 38.
— ου	-	-	Mt. i. 25. ² .
— τουτου	-	-	L. xxii. 51.
			<i>Z</i>
<i>Ζηλωτης</i>	-	-	L. vi. 15.
<i>Ζημιωω</i>	-	-	Mt. xvi. 26.
<i>Ζιζανια</i>	-	-	Mt. xiii. 25.
<i>Ζωρεω</i>	-	-	L. v. 10.
<i>Ζων υδαω</i>	-	-	J. iv. 10.
			<i>H</i>
<i>Ηγεμονεω</i>	-	-	L. ii. 4. ² .
<i>Ηγεμων</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17. Mt. ii. 6. ² .
<i>Ηλικια</i>	-	-	L. xii. 25.
<i>Ηρωδιανου</i>	-	-	Mt. xxii. 16.
			<i>Θ</i>
<i>Θαλασσα</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 15. ² .
<i>Θαυβος</i>	-	-	L. v. 9.
<i>Θαπτω</i>	-	-	J. xix. 40.

Θελω	-	-	-	{ Mt. xvi. 24. L. xiii. 31. J. vii. 17. xvii. 24.
Θεμελιος	-	-	-	Mt. xxv. 34.
Θεου οικος	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 4.
ὁ Θεος του αιωνος και ε.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Θεοφιλος	-	-	-	L. i. 3. ³ .
Θησαυρος	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 19.
Θρηνος	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 17.
Θυγατριον	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.

I

Ιδιος	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 22. J. i. 11. v. 18.
Ιερων	-	-	-	L. i. 9.
Ικανον εστι	-	-	-	L. xxii. 38.
Πλεως σοι	-	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22. ³ .
Ιματιον	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 2. J. xiii. 4.
Ινα	-	-	-	{ Mt. i. 22. ² . xx. 31. Mr. v. 23. J. xvi. 2.
Ισος	-	-	-	Mr. xiv. 56.
ὁ Ισχυρος	-	-	-	L. xi. 21.
Ισως	-	-	-	L. xx. 13.
Ιουδαιιστ	-	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 15.
Ιχθυδιον	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.

K

Καθαιρω	-	-	-	J. xv. 2.
Καθαρισμος	-	-	-	L. ii. 22.
Καθαρος	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Καθαρος τη καρδια	-	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
Καθεξης	-	-	-	L. i. 3. ² .
Καθευδειν	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 23.
Καθηγητης	-	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 8.
Καθημερινος	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 11.
Καδιξεσθαι	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.
Και	-	-	-	Mt. v. 19. ² .
ἡ Καινη διαθηκη	-	-	-	D. V. P. III.
Καιομενον	-	-	-	J. v. 35. ² .
Καιρος συκων	-	-	-	Mr. xi. 13.
Κακολογειω	-	-	-	Mt. xv. 4.
Κακοποιεω	-	-	-	Mr. iii. 4.
Κακος	-	-	-	Mt. xxi. 41. xxv. 26.
Καλεομαι μεγας	-	-	-	Mt. v. 19. ⁴ .
Καμηλος	-	-	-	Mt. xix. 24.
Καρδια	-	-	-	D. IV. § 23, 24.
Κατα	-	-	-	Mt. Title. J. ii. 6. ² .
Καταβαινω	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 20.
Καταβολη κοσμου	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. Mt. xxv. 34.
Καταγγελω	-	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 15.
Κατακλινομαι	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 3.

Κατακρινω	-	-	Mr. xvi. 16. ³ . J. viii. 11.
Καταλυμα	-	-	L. ii. 7. ² .
Καταλυω	-	-	Mt. v. 17.
Καταναθεματιζω	-	-	Mt. xv. 4.
Καταρρομαι	-	-	Ibid.
Καταρτιζω	-	-	Mr. i. 19.
Κατασκηνωσις	-	-	Mt. viii. 20. ² .
Καταχθονιοι	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 6.
Κατεχω	-	-	L. iv. 42. ² .
Κενυριων	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Κερας	-	-	L. i. 69, 70, 71.
Κερατιον	-	-	L. xv. 16. ² .
Κεφαλαιω	-	-	Mr. xii. 4.
Κερυκειω	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 2.
Κηρυσσω κ. ε.	-	-	D. VI. P. V. § 2—10.
Κητος	-	-	Mt. xii. 40.
Κλεπτης	-	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Κληρονομew	-	-	Mt. v. 5.
Κλητος	-	-	Mt. xxii. 14.
Κλιβανος	-	-	Mt. vi. 30. ² .
Κλιναδιον	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Κλισια	-	-	Mr. vi. 40.
Κοδραντης	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Κοιλια	-	-	Mr. vii. 19.
Κοιμαν	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 13.
Κοινος	-	-	Mr. vii. 2.
Κολαζεσθαι	-	-	Mt. i. 19. ² .
Κολοβω	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 22.
Κολπος του Αβρααμ	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 19, 20.
Κολυμβηθρα	-	-	J. v. 2. ² .
Κορβαν	-	-	Mr. vii. 11, 12.
Κορβαναν	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 6.
Κοσμεω	-	-	Mt. xii. 44.
Κοσμος	-	-	D. III. § 8.
Κουστιωδια	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 65.
Κοφινος	-	-	Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Κρασπεδον	-	-	Mt. ix. 20.
Κρατιστος	-	-	L. i. 3. ⁴ .
Κριμα	-	-	Mr. xii. 40.
Κρινω	-	-	Mr. xvi. 16. ³ .
Κρισις	-	-	Mt. xxiii. ² . J. v. 22.
ο εν τω Κρυπτω	-	-	Mt. vi. 8.
Κταομαι	-	-	L. xxi. 19.
Κτιζω	-	-	D. III. § 7.
Κυλλος	-	-	Mt. xv. 30, 31.
Κυναριον	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Κυριακη	-	-	J. v. 2. ² .
Κυριος	-	-	D. VII. P. I. Mr. xii. 2. 9.

Κωμικος	-	-	-	D. IV. § 17.
				<i>Α</i>
Λαλεω	-	-	-	{ D. VI. P. V. § 11, 12. L. i. 69, 70, 71. iv. 41. ² . J. xii. 49.
Λαμβανω	-	-	-	Mt. viii. 17.
Λαμπρος	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 11.
Λατρεία	-	-	-	J. xvi. 2. ² .
Λατρωνω	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
συ Λεγεις	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 11.
Λειτουργω	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 12.
Λεπτον	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
Λευκος	-	-	-	L. xxiii. 11.
Ληστης	-	-	-	D. XI. P. II. § 6.
Λιθοβολω	-	-	-	Mt. xxi. 35.
Λινον τυφομενον	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 20.
Λογος	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 4. L. i. 2. J. i. 1.
Λογον της χαριτος	-	-	-	L. iv. 22. ² .
Λοιπον	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 45.
Λουω	-	-	-	J. ix. 7.
Λυχνος	-	-	-	Mt. v. 15.
Λυω	-	-	-	—— 19. xviii. 18.

Μ

Μαγδαληνη	-	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 56.
Μαγοι	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 1.
Μαθητεωι	-	-	-	Mt. xxviii. 19, 20.
Μακαριος	-	-	-	Mt. v. 3. xiii. 16.
Μακραν	-	-	-	Mt. viii. 30.
Μακροθυμω	-	-	-	L. xviii. 7.
Μακροθυμια	-	-	-	L. viii. 15.
Μαμωνα της αδικιας	-	-	-	L. xvi. 9.
Μανθανω	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 29.
Μαρτυρ	-	-	-	D. IX. P. IV. § 14.
Μαρτυρειν τινι	-	-	-	L. iv. 22.
Μεγιστανες	-	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Μεθυω	-	-	-	J. ii. 10.
Μελλω	-	-	-	Mt. iii. 7. xvii. 22.
Μεριζω	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51.
Μεριμναω	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 25.
Μετα	-	-	-	L. xi. 7.
Μεταμελομαι	-	-	-	D. VI. P. III.
Μετανοεω	-	-	-	Ibid.
Μετοιχεσια, Μετοικια	-	-	-	Mt. i. 11, 12.
Μετρητης	-	-	-	J. ii. 6.
Μετρον πιστεως	-	-	-	D. IV. § 14.
Μηλωτη	-	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. ² .
Μηποτε	-	-	-	Mt. iv. 6.
Μητι, Μητιγς	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 22. J. iv. 29.

<i>Μισεω</i>	-	-	-	L. xiv. 26.
<i>Μνα</i>	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 10.
<i>Μνημα</i>	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 8.
<i>Μνησθηται ελεους</i>	-	-	-	L. i. 54, 55. ¹ . ² .
<i>Μοδιος</i>	-	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 6. Mt. v. 15. ² .
<i>Μοιχαλις</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 39.
<i>Μοιχευω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. v. 28.
<i>Μυλη</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
<i>Μυλος ονικος</i>	-	-	-	Ibid.
<i>Μυρον</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 7.
<i>Μυστηριον</i>	-	-	-	D. IX. P. I. Mt. xiii. 11.
<i>Μωρε</i>	-	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 25.
<i>Μωρολογια</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
<i>Μωρος</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ³ .
N				
<i>Ναζαρηνος</i>	}	-	-	Mt. ii. 23.
<i>Ναζωραιος</i>		-	-	
<i>Ναι, ναι</i>	-	-	-	Mt. v. 37.
<i>Ναος</i>	-	-	-	L. i. 9.
<i>Ναρθος πιστικη</i>	-	-	-	Mr. xiv. 3. ² .
<i>Νεανισκος</i>	-	-	-	———— 51. ² .
<i>Νεοτης</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xix. 20.
<i>Νηπιον</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ³ .
<i>Νιπτω</i>	-	-	-	Mr. vii. 3, 4. J. ix. 7.
<i>Νοεω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 15. ³ .
<i>Νομιζομαι</i>	-	-	-	L. iii. 23. ² .
<i>Νομικος</i>	-	-	-	D. XII. P. V. § 12.
<i>Νομοδιδασκαλος</i>	-	-	-	Ibid.
<i>Νομος</i>	-	-	-	J. x. 34.
Ξ				
<i>Ξυλον</i>	-	-	-	L. xxii. 52. ² . Mt. vi. 30.
O				
<i>Ο, η, το</i>	-	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 2. Mt. i. 6. v. 15. ³ .
<i>Οικια</i>	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Οικοδομεω</i>	-	-	-	D. IV. § 18.
<i>Οικονομος της αδικιας</i>	-	-	-	L. xvi. 8. ² .
<i>ο Οικος του Θεου</i>	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 4.
<i>Οικουμενη</i>	-	-	-	L. ii. 1.
<i>Οικτειρω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. x . 36.
<i>Ολιγοπιστος</i>	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 30. ³ .
<i>Ολιγοψυχος</i>	-	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ .
<i>Ομοιοπαθης</i>	-	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
<i>Ομοιωμα</i>	-	-	-	J. v. 37, 38.
<i>Ομοφρονες</i>	-	-	-	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
<i>Οναριον</i>	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Θνειδιζω</i>	-	-	-	Mt. v. 11.

Ονικος	-	-	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
Ονομα	-	-	-	J. xvii. 11.
Ονος αλετης	-	-	-	Mt. xviii. 6.
Οπισω μου	-	-	-	Mt. xvi. 24. ² .
Οπως	-	-	-	Mt. xii. 14.
Οριζω	-	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 7.
Ορεινη	-	-	-	Mr. i. 3.
Ορκιζω	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 63. Mr. v. 7.
Ορφανος	-	-	-	J. xiv. 11.
Οσιος κ. ε.	-	-	-	D. VI. P. IV.
Οτι	-	-	-	{ D. X. P. III. § 4. P. V. § 11. } L. i. 45. ² . vii. 47.
Ου, ου	-	-	-	Mt. v. 37.
Ου ενεκεν	-	-	-	L. iv. 18.
Ου πας	-	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X. P. II. § 8, 9.
Ουαι	-	-	-	L. vi. 24, 25, 26.
Ουδεν εστιν	-	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 16. 18.
Ουκετι	-	-	-	Mr. xv. 5.
Ουρανοι	-	-	-	D. V. P. I. § 4.
Ουτιος	-	-	-	D. III. § 23. Mt. xii. 24.
Οφελημα	-	-	-	Mt. vi. 12.
ο Οφεις ο παλαιος	-	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 8.
Οφαριον	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Οψε	-	-	-	Mt. xxviii. 1.
Οψια	-	-	-	Mt. xiv. 23.
Οψις	-	-	-	J. vii. 24.

II

Παρις	-	-	-	Mt. v. 29.
Πιθος	-	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
Παιδιον κ. ε.	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11. 19. J. xiii. 33.
Παις	-	-	-	Mt. ii. 16. ² .
η Παλαια διαθηκη	-	-	-	D. V. P. III.
Παλαι	-	-	-	Mr. xv. 44.
Παλαιστη	-	-	-	L. xii. 25.
Παλιγγενεσια	-	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 22. Mt. xix. 28.
Πανδοχειον	-	-	-	L. ii. 7. ² .
Πανουργος	-	-	-	D. IV. § 18.
Παντοτροφος	-	-	-	J. iv. 10.
Παρα	-	-	-	J. xvii. 5.
οι Παρ' αυτου	-	-	-	Mr. iii. 21. ² .
Παραβιαζομαι	-	-	-	L. xxiv. 29.
Παραβολη	-	-	-	Mt. xiii. 3.
Παραδειγματιζω	-	-	-	Mt. i. 19. ² .
Παραδεισος	-	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 21.
Παραδιδωμι	-	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 16.
Παραδοξα	-	-	-	L. v. 26.
Παραδοσις	-	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 8.

<i>Παραδους</i>	-	-	D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
<i>Παρακλητος κ. ε.</i>	-	-	J. xiv. 16.
<i>Παρακολουθεω</i>	-	-	L. i. 3.
<i>Παρασκευη</i>	-	-	J. xix. 16.
<i>Παρατηρεω</i>	-	-	J. xv. 20.
<i>Παροιμια</i>	-	-	J. xvi. 25.
<i>Πασχα</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 3, 4. J. xix. 14.
<i>Πας</i>	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8.
<i>Πασχειν</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 25.
<i>Πατρις</i>	-	-	J. iv. 44.
<i>Πεξη</i>	-	-	Mt. xiv. 13.
<i>Πειναω</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 6.
<i>Πειραζω</i>	-	-	Mt. xvi. 1.
<i>ο Πειραζων</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 4.
<i>Πεμπω</i>	-	-	J. x. 36. Mt. vi. 13.
<i>Πεπραγμενον αυτω</i>	-	-	L. xxiii. 15.
<i>Περαν</i>	-	-	Mt. iv. 15.
<i>Περατης</i>	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 15.
<i>Περιβαλλω</i>	-	-	Mr. xiv. 51.
<i>Περιοικος</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
<i>Περισσευω</i>	-	-	Mt. v. 20.
<i>Περισσον</i>	-	-	———— 47. ² .
<i>Περιτομη</i>	-	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 2.
<i>Περιχωρος</i>	-	-	Mr. i. 28.
<i>Πετρα, Πετρος</i>	-	-	J. i. 43.
<i>τα Πετρωδη</i>	-	-	Mt. xiii. 5.
<i>Πηρα εις οδον</i>	-	-	Mt. x. 10.
<i>Πηγυς</i>	-	-	L. xii. 25.
<i>Πινακιδιον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Πιστευω</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. ii. 22. ² .
<i>της Πιστεως αναλογια</i>	-	-	D. IV. § 14.
<i>Πιστις</i>	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 23. ² . L. xviii. 8.
<i>Πιστος</i>	-	-	J. xx. 27.
<i>Πλειον</i>	-	-	Mt. xii. 41, 42.
<i>Πλειονες</i>	-	-	Mt. xxi. 36.
<i>Πλεονεξια</i>	-	-	Mr. vii. 22.
<i>Πληροφορεω</i>	-	-	L. i. 1.
<i>Πληρωω</i>	-	-	Mt. i. 22. v. 17. ² .
<i>Πλησιον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
<i>Πλοιαριον</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 19.
<i>Πλοιον</i>	-	-	L. v. 2.
<i>Πνευμα, Πνεω</i>	-	-	{ D. VIII. P. III. § 10, 11. D. VI. } P. II. § 23. Mr. ii. 8. J. iii. 8.
———— <i>ακαθαρτον, πονηρον</i>	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 11.
<i>Πνευματα</i>	-	-	D. XII. P. IV. § 9.
<i>εκ Πνευματος γεγεννημενος</i>	-	-	J. iii. 8.
<i>Ποιεω</i>	-	-	D. III. § 7. D. X. P. V. § 12.
<i>Ποιμαινω</i>	-	-	J. xxi. 16.

Πολλοι	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8. J. xii. 42.
Πολυελεος	-	-	D. VI. P. IV. § 3.
Πονηρος	-	-	Mt. v. 37. ² . vi. 23. xxv. 26.
ὁ Πονηρος	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 4. 8.
Πορνεια	-	-	Mt. v. 32.
Πρασια	-	-	Mr. vi. 40.
Πρασσω	-	-	L. iii. 13.
Πρανθυμος	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ .
Πρεσβυτεριον	-	-	L. xxii. 66.
Προ	-	-	D. IV. § 20.
Προβατικη	-	-	J. v. 2. ² .
Προγνωσκω	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
Προδους	-	-	D. III. § 23. Mt. xxvi. 16.
Προερεω	-	-	D. IV. § 21.
Προορασμα	-	-	— § 20.
Προς	-	-	L. xix. 9.
Προς η̅μας	-	-	Mr. vi. 3.
Προς το	-	-	Mt. v. 28. ² .
Προσαιτων	-	-	L. xvi. 20.
Προσευχη	-	-	L. vi. 12.
Προσκυνεω	-	-	Mt. ii. 2. ² .
Προσλαβομενος	-	-	Mt. xvi. 22.
Προφασις	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 14.
Προφητης	-	-	Mt. vii. 15. Mr. vi. 15.
Προφητεω	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 68.
Προποκλισια	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 6.
Πρωτος	-	-	L. ii. 2. xiv. 1. J. xv. 18.
Προτοκοκος	-	-	Mt. i. 25.
Πτερυγιον του ἱματιου	-	-	Mt. ix. 20.
Πτυον	-	-	Mt. iii. 12.
Πτωχος	-	-	L. xvi. 20.
Πτωχοι τω πνευματι	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ .
Πυγμα	-	-	Mr. vii. 3, 4.
Πυλαι α̅δου	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 17.
Πωρωσις	-	-	D. IV. § 23. N.

P

Ραββι	-	-	D. VII. P. II.
Ραβδος	-	-	L. xxii. 52. ² .
Ραινω	}	-	Mt. iii. 11.
Ραντιξω			
Ρακα	-	-	Fr. Mt. § 25.
Ρακος αγραφον	-	-	Mt. ix. 16.
Ρημα	-	-	{ D. I. P. I. § 14. N. D. X.
— αργον	-	-	{ P. II. § 9. Mt. iv. 4.
Ριπτω	-	-	Mt. xii. 36.
Ρυομαι	-	-	Mt. ix. 36. ² .
	-	-	Mt. vi. 13. ² .

			Σ
Σαββας	-	-	Mt. xii. 5.
Σαββατον	-	-	Ibid.
Σαγγηνη	-	-	Mt. iv. 18.
Σαπρος	-	-	Mt. vii. 17.
Σαρξ	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 11. 14. N. N. J. viii. 15.
Σατανας	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3. 5. 3, 9.
Σεισμος	-	-	Mt. xxviii. 1.
Σεληνιαζομαι	-	-	Mt. xvii. 15.
Σημειον	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 30.
Σικεια	-	-	L. i. 15.
Σκαιθαλιζω	-	-	Mt. v. 29. xiii. 21. 57. D. XI. P. I. § 22.
Σκαιθαλον	-	-	Mt. xiii. 41.
Σκηνη	-	-	Mt. xvii. 4. L. xvi. 9. ³ .
Σκηνοπηγια	-	-	D. VIII. P. II. § 3.
Σκηρως	-	-	J. i. 14. ² .
Σκια θανατου	-	-	Mt. iv. 16.
Σκληροκαρδια	-	-	D. IV. § 22.
Σκληρυνω	-	-	Ibid.
Σκολοψ	-	-	Mt. vii. 3.
Σκωλον	-	-	Mt. v. 29.
Σοφια λογου	-	-	D. I. P. I. § 10.
Σοφος	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ³ .
Σπεκοιλατωρ	-	-	Mr. vi. 27.
Σπλαγχνιζομαι	-	-	Mt. ix. 36.
Σπλην	-	-	D. IV. § 24.
Σπορος	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.
Σπυρις	-	-	Mt. xvi. 9, 10.
Στατηρ	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 8.
Σταυρος	-	-	Mt. x. 38. N.
Σταυρω	-	-	Mr. xv. 25.
Στομαχος	-	-	Mr. vii. 19.
Στρατηγοι του ιερου	-	-	L. xxii. 52.
Στραφω	-	-	Mt. xviii. 3.
Στροννημι	-	-	Mr. xiv. 15.
Συ λεγεις	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 11.
Συγχρασομαι	-	-	J. iv. 9.
Συχοφαντεω	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 16.
Συχοφαντης	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 18.
Συμβαλλω	-	-	L. ii. 19.
Συμπληρουσθαι	-	-	L. ix. 51.
Συμποσιον	-	-	Mr. vi. 40.
Συνεδριον	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 18.
Συνετος	-	-	Mt. xi. 25. ³ .
Συνθηκη	-	-	D. V. P. III. § 1.
Συνιημι	-	-	Mt. xiii. 19.
Συνοδια	-	-	L. ii. 44.
Συντελεια	-	-	Mt. xiii. 39.

Συντηροεω	-	-	Mr. vi. 10.
Συντριβω	-	-	Mr. xiv. 3. ² .
Σφραγιζω	-	-	J. iii. 33.
Σχισμα	-	-	D. IX. P. III.
Σωτηρ	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 8.
Σωτηριον	-	-	L. ii. 30, 31.

T

Ταλαντον	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 8. 10.
Ταπεινος	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ . D. II. P. II. § 2.
—— τη καρδια	-	-	Mt. xi. 29. ² .
Ταπεινοσρων	-	-	Mt. v. 3. ³ . D. II. P. II. § 2.
Ταραχος	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 19.
Ταφος	-	-	—— § 8.
Τεκνιον	-	-	J. xiii. 33. D. XII. P. I. § 19.
Τεκνον	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Τεκτων	-	-	Mt. xiii. 55.
Τελειν πολεις	-	-	Mt. x. 23. ³ .
Τελωνης	-	-	Mt. v. 46.
Τελωνιον	-	-	Mt. ix. 9.
Τεταρταιος	-	-	J. xi. 39.
Τετραραρχης	-	-	Mt. xiv. 1.
Τηροεω	-	-	J. xv. 20.
Τι	-	-	Mr. viii. 37.
Τιμαω	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 15. J. xii. 26.
Τοκος	-	-	Mt. xxv. 27.
Τολμαω	-	-	Mr. xii. 34. J. xxi. 12. ³ .
Τοπος αγιος	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 15.
Τραγκιος	-	-	D. IV. § 17.
Τριστατης	-	-	D. VII. P. I. § 7.
Τροφη	-	-	Mt. x. 10. ⁴ .
Τροχος	-	-	L. xii. 25.
Τυφομενον λινον	-	-	Mt. xii. 20.

Υ

*Υγια	-	-	D. X. P. II. § 4.
*Υδωρ ζων	-	-	J. iv. 10. ² .
ο Υιος του ανθρωπου	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 13.
—— της απολειας κ, ε.	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 1.
—— Δαβιδ	-	-	D. V. P. IV. § 14.
—— Θεου κ. ε.	-	-	Mt. xiv. 33.
—— Διαβολου	-	-	D. VI. P. I. § 3. P. II. § 1.
Υιοι του νυμφωνος	-	-	Mr. ii. 19.
*Υμνεω	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 30.
*Υπαγω	-	-	J. xii. 11.
*Υπαρχοντα	-	-	L. xi. 21.
*Υπηροτης	-	-	Mt. xxvi. 58. ² . L. i. 2. ii. 14, iv. 20.
*Υποδηματα	-	-	Mt. x. 10. ³ .
*Υποκατω της γης	-	-	D. VI. P. II. § 6.

Ἐποκριτής	-	-	Mt. xxiv. 51. ² . D. III. § 24.
Ἐπομνη	-	-	L. viii. 15.
Ἐποστασις	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 9.
Ἐσωπος	-	-	J. xix. 29.
Ἐψιστος	-	-	L. ii. 14.
Ἐψω	-	-	J. iii. 14.

Φ

Φαγεῖν ἄρτον	-	-	L. xiv. 15.
Φατῆ	-	-	L. ii. 7.
Φιλοθέος	-	-	L. i. 3. ³ .
Φιλοπρωτεύων	-	-	D. VII. P. II. § 11.
Φίλος	-	-	D. XII. P. I. § 11.
Φιλοσοφος	-	-	D. XI. P. I. § 18.
Φοινίκη	-	-	Pr. Mt. § 15.
Φρονεῖν	-	-	D. IX. P. III. § 4.
Φυλακτηριον	-	-	Mt. xxiii. 5.
Φωλεος	-	-	Mt. viii. 20.

Χ

Χαιρω	-	-	Mt. xxviii. 9. ³ .
Χαρά ἢ ἐμῆ	-	-	J. xvii. 13.
Χαραξ	-	-	L. xix. 43.
Χαρις	-	-	L. ii. 40. J. i. 17.
Χαριτω	-	-	L. i. 28.
Χειροτονεω	-	-	D. X. P. V. § 7.
Χιλιάρχος	-	-	D. VIII. P. III. § 17.
Χιτων	-	-	§ 2.
Χοινῆξ	-	-	D. VIII. P. I. § 4.
Χολη	-	-	Mt. xxvii. 34.
Χορτος	-	-	Mt. vi. 30.
Χρεία	-	-	L. viii. 15.
Χρηματιζω	-	-	Mt. ii. 12.
Χριστος	-	-	D. V. P. IV.
Χωρεω	-	-	Mt. xix. 12.
Χωριον	-	-	J. iv. 5.

Ψ

Ψευδοπροφητης	-	-	Mt. vii. 15.
Ψευστης	-	-	D. III. § 24.
Ψυχη	-	-	{ D. X. P. V. § 6. Mt. x. 39. xvi. } 26. L. xiv. 26.

Ω

Ἔωρα	-	-	Mt. viii. 13. xxiv. 36.
Ἔσει	-	-	L. iii. 23.

